

1 666  
#6648

LITERARY  
AND  
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

---

NO. V.—MARCH, 1835.

---

ART. I. MEANS OF PROMOTING CHRISTIANITY.

By ELEAZAR LORD, Esq., New-York.

THE divine influence is the sole efficient cause of all the success of Christianity, whether with respect to individuals or communities.

No means or instrumentalities are to be employed but those which are divinely sanctioned, and which are therefore appropriate to the co-operation of that influence.

The degree of success will be proportioned to the right use of these means. It were inconsistent with the very nature and all the pretensions of Christianity to argue otherwise, and would imply that the truths and sanctions of the Gospel were less adapted, even with aid from on high, to affect men's minds, than the perversions of error.

There is in the divine purpose and constitution with respect to these means and the nature and affections of the human mind, a fitness and connexion, on the ground of which, by the concurrence of the divine agency, success may be expected to follow their use, and cannot be looked for without the appropriate instrumentality.

This connexion, fitness, and co-operation is analogous to that which occurs in other cases involving human agency, as in that of agriculture: insomuch that a departure from the scriptural method, and a reliance on other influences and grounds of success, will as certainly end in disappointment, as the calculations of a husbandman would, who, to produce wheat should sow tares, or who should look for a crop without sowing any seed.

But there have been in modern, as well as earlier times, wide departures from the simplicity of the Gospel, and reliance has been extensively placed, in the reformed churches, on other means of success.

Instead of specifying at large in what instances and what respects in the history of Protestant Christendom there have been the most notable failures to employ evangelical means in simple dependence on the divine influence, it will be more to the present purpose to notice some of the substitutes and inferior causes on which reliance for success has been extensively reposed. The results anticipated and realized from these substitutes amount to little more than a kind of public worldly influence of Christianity, an outward respectability, a tolerated observance of its forms, a temporal support of its institutions, and certain secular benefits to society.

Among those inferior grounds of dependence for the success of the Gospel, *Learning* must be named as the first and most conspicuous. When the church emerged from the ignorance and corruption of the dark ages, and caught a glimpse of the light and glory of the Gospel in contrast with the reigning and universal superstition, imposture and wickedness, the minds of men were roused, and the transition gave to every species of knowledge a captivating power; and in relation to the first and main object, the conversion and salvation of men, assigned to human learning a mistaken office and an undue importance, which the invention of printing encouraged, and various causes have helped to perpetuate.

Let every one think as he pleases, but let no one's temper be disturbed, if it be urged that the reformers and their successors erred on this subject. Let it be candidly considered, whether instead of relying on the inculcation of those simple and essential truths of the Gospel which are adapted to the capacities and feelings of the common mind, however ignorant of other things, and on the divine influence, as the immediate and sole ground of confidence and hope, they did not too much exalt, and too much depend on, the efforts of reason, the arms of controversy, and the powers of learning? Instead of calculating on the boundless resources of moral influence and renovation which proceed from the simple inculcations of the Gospel, and addressing their efforts accordingly, did they not direct their zeal quite too much against the heretical doctrines, abominable customs, and tyrannical power of the hierarchy to which they were opposed?

Whatever may be alleged in its defence, whatever causes

may be assigned as leading to it, did not the course which they adopted at once place Christianity in a position to require defence, constant defence against the arrogance of puny mortals, and defence on other grounds and by other means than its own intrinsic elements, its divine verities, its spirit of love, purity, and humility, its claims on the conscience, its hopes, its sanctions, its alliance with the agency and glory of God?

Did not their view of the contest they were to prosecute, unavoidably lead to the use of weapons similar to those by which they were assailed, and to transfer the scene of action from the field of spiritual conquest, the hearts and consciences of the common people, to the intellects and passions of the learned and the great? Were not the acquisitions and efforts of ministers dictated by this view of the case? Did it not become necessary, that they should explore all those paths of learning in which their enemies were intrenched, and those newer ones which they opened, and which augmented their intellectual force, and gave them advantages of position? Did not this policy naturally require, that their learning should appear conspicuously in their sermons, as well as in their books; that in addition to their controversies with each other, they should fight the enemy at all points; that they should openly attack and oppose each and every thing which they deemed erroneous in theory and practice, every thing in the theological, ecclesiastical, and political world, every thing in the religious rites and established customs of society, every thing in the stupendous fabric of papal imposture, and in the dark workings of the whole mystery of iniquity which could be argued against, ridiculed or denounced?

The Reformers, whose praise needs not the tribute of any feeble tongue of the present day, had themselves, in common with all around them, been enveloped in the clouds of Romish ignorance and superstition. When they opened their eyes and discovered those effulgent truths of the Gospel which are quick and powerful, sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and discerning the thoughts and intents of the heart, it need not be wondered at, that in view of the abominations of Rome, and the degraded and hopeless condition of the people, they were impelled to extremes by the spirit of controversy; that seeing the reins of absolute power, ecclesiastical

and political, in the hands of a few of the trained and leading agents of the Pope, they were induced to turn the influence and the associated and public efforts of Christianity, and all the artillery of learning and wit, against them; that they deemed an intellectual and political victory, necessary as a preparation for the Gospel to have free course and be glorified.

To those who have leisure and curiosity, it will be worth the trouble to read the history of this prolonged battle with the powers of the air, and mark how the intellectual and political resources which were so much depended on, and so earnestly employed on the part of Christianity, were gradually expended, or engrossed by the enemy, and how naturally the present state of those parts of Europe which were the scene of these events, has resulted from the mistaken course adopted by the first Reformers.

In the light of that history, the tendency of their system is clearly to be seen, and there can be no hazard in saying, that like all the efforts of heated controversy and excited passion at the present day, their proceedings were calculated to divert attention from the spiritual and practical import of the Gospel, to the points in dispute, and to their connexion with the affairs of civil government, the rights of the people, and other secular and extraneous matters. Rulers and politicians seized the rising ferment as a means of securing their power and gaining strength for its defence; and the people, suffering under the iron rod of despotism and superstition, like the Jews on the earliest announcement of Christianity, were first and chiefly anxious to be delivered from the yoke of political tyranny.

It is therefore no matter of surprise, that the Scriptures should have received less attention, and been less read, less understood and less regarded, even by the learned, at least in Germany, a century after, than immediately before the dawn of the reformation. That such was the case may be rendered sufficiently evident by a single testimony, that of Spener, one of the founders of the school of Biblical Theology at Halle, near the close of the seventeenth century. He states, that it was usual for persons having an education for the ministry, to spend five or six years at the Universities without hearing, or caring to hear, a single book, chapter, or verse of the Bible explained. It is also stated by the Translator of Knapp's "Theology," from whom the above is

taken, "that in the few cases when exegetical lectures were commenced, by such teachers as Olearius and Carpzov, they were soon abandoned. The Bible was perhaps less used before the time of Spener, in Protestant Universities, than it had been, under penalty of excommunication, by pious Catholics before the reformation. In place of the Scriptures, the different symbols established by the Protestant church were taught and studied. The minutest distinctions established by them were contended for with the greatest zeal, and the least deviation from them, was pronounced heresy as decidedly as if they had been given by inspiration of God, and was punished accordingly with the greatest severity. The spirit of Protestantism seemed to have thrown off the hierarchal yoke, only to assume another and perhaps a more degrading form of bondage. In explaining and defending these symbols, the Aristotelian dialectics were employed, and in the use of them the students were thoroughly exercised. As to the practical effect which the doctrines of Christianity should have upon their own hearts, and the manner in which they should exhibit them for the benefit of others, nothing was said to them by their teachers. Thus disciplined they went forth, to repeat from the pulpit what they had learned from the University, and fought over their idle battles, in which their own learning and skill were carefully displayed, to the neglect of every thing which might arouse the careless, persuade the doubting, or satisfy the deep desires, and assuage the sorrows of the heart."

"This was a state of things which Spener deplored. Others before him, especially pious laymen, had noticed these evils; but had withdrawn, like the mystics of a former period, and sought in private contemplation that satisfaction of their spiritual wants, which they could not obtain from the learned jargon of the pulpit; or if, like Andreæ and Arndt, they had lifted a voice of remonstrance against the prevailing disorders, it had been drowned in the noise of angry polemics."

Behold a different example! On the appearance of our Saviour the state of the world, and especially of Judea, was, with respect to religion, very much like that of Europe at the date of the reformation. Pomp, ceremony, ritual forms, intolerance, pride, bigotry, and the whole list of iniquities, perversions, and heresies abounded on every side; religion had ceased to exert any practical influence on the hearts,

and lives of the Jewish people, generally, and the attention of the learned doctors and expounders of the law, both Jewish and Samaritan, was wholly absorbed by sectarian controversy and theoretic questions; while the Sadducees courted and obtained the favour of the great, and the Pharisees that of the ignorant and profligate multitude. Our Saviour beholding them in this condition, compares the people to sheep wandering without a shepherd, and their pretended guides to men smitten with blindness. Yet these leaders displayed great zeal for the law, and its outward rites and ceremonies. They were ready to suffer and die for their conflicting doctrines, theories, and traditions; but wholly neglected *that teaching of individuals and families*, in the house, and by the way-side, which Moses had expressly enjoined, as the means of perpetuating religion among them.

Did Christ and his disciples direct their efforts chiefly against these heads and leaders of the nation, or against their pretensions and errors, or any thing relating to them? Did they ever go after them, or seek them? When they came into our Saviour's presence did he invite a controversy, or argue with them except from premises which they admitted, and by which they were self-convicted? Is it not evident from their history, that the first teachers of Christianity, both to Jews and Gentiles, avoided all direct and systematic assaults on the customs of society, and the power and influence of rulers and leaders, however perverted and absurd, and devoted almost their whole attention to the common people, in the most inoffensive, humble, Christ-like manner possible? And is it not equally notorious, that while this simple, unpretending, despised instrumentality was continued, in perfect dependence on the Divine influence, though the wisdom of the wise was scandalized, and the passions of the contentious, and the curiosity of the vain and foolish, were disappointed, the progress of Christianity was rapid and irresistible? And what was the first indication of its decline, but the gorgon head of rabbinical, allegorical, philosophical, and political learning thrusting itself into the sanctuary, and essaying to engraft upon the Gospel a score of opposing theories and systems, and to smother the church in a cloud of pagan darkness and folly!

This misplaced dependence on learning continues to the present day. At this hour, in the most favoured nations,

Christianity is a disputed, controverted, unsettled question ; a question of criticism, of philosophy, of history ; a question involving politics and literature ; a question about which men differ as widely as at any former period, and which, though it be treated somewhat differently, is no nearer being settled than heretofore. The only demonstration which it owns, or will admit of, has been withheld. Its friends, instead of exemplifying its humility, benevolence, and heavenly spirit in their lives, and applying it to the young, the poor, the ignorant, the mass of the people, have regarded it as a difficult, abstruse, complicated subject, involving many uncertain and doubtful matters, and requiring to be defended by learning, art, and subtility. Instead of being considered as an affair of the heart, it is treated first, and chiefly, as an affair of the head. Instead of being within the capacity of a Hottentot, or Laplander, it is supposed to require deep study, intellectual effort, and subtility, on the part of its converts. The continual droppings of learned officiousness have worn away the plain and simple features of the original, and covered its emaciated form with such a load of glosses, explanations, queries, distinctions, doubts, and difficulties, as to put at defiance all pretence of harmony or consistency, and render it a matter of wonder, that any two persons should exactly agree, or be perfectly content to differ, on any one point. It is to a greater or less extent in every community supposed to be, with respect to its claims, its authority, and its bearing on the future destinies of men, on a level with other religions. It is judged of, not by any reference to its author, nor by its own pure light, but by its elevation or depression in the scale of human reason, the learning and prowess of its defenders, and the state of pending controversies.

The truth is, discouraging and humiliating as it may be, the great mass of the people in Protestant Christendom know little or nothing of the Gospel ; and perhaps as large a proportion of those who are instructed, and even learned, in other matters, have no idea of the spiritual nature and design of Christianity, as of those who are most ignorant of all other things. And there is but too much reason to apprehend, that the religion of Protestants in this country is in danger of a similar eclipse to that which long since obscured its light in Germany.

The people are not taught. The system is such, that it

requires an educated Protestant minister, alas, in how many instances ! six whole days of study and rest, to prepare himself to deliver two lectures, essays, or sermons, of thirty or forty minutes each, on the Lord's day, to such persons as may please to come to hear him. These generally must be carefully written, in learned and set terms, so as to be unintelligible to many of the auditory, lest in the infinite confusion of ideas in which the subject is involved, and the labyrinth of definitions, distinctions, doubts, and perplexities which crowd upon the question on every side, he should make some mistake, use some wrong words, cross somebody's track, or in some way get out of the *traces*. This habit on their part disqualifies them in every respect for that simple, familiar, colloquial teaching, by which alone the young, the uneducated, the common mind, can ever be instructed. Ministers are too often a class by themselves—a learned, recluse body, as far removed from the associations, capacities, and sympathies of the people generally, as were the priests of Egypt, and the philosophers of Greece, or as are the Babel tongues of their libraries. Is it any wonder that the most diligent of their hearers, when for the time they ought to be teachers themselves, have need that one teach them again and again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God ? Is it any wonder that the pure, demonstrative, resistless light of the Gospel, cannot be seen through such a confused mass of artificial net-work, such a compound of bewildering technicalities, abstractions, and mysteries !

This system seems unavoidably to require, what is so commonly, and with so much surprise observed, that the glow of love in the newly renovated heart, should be chilled, restrained, and compelled to give precedence to the theories, notions, and abstractions of the head. No sooner does a convert discern, with grateful and admiring transport, the divine beauty, loveliness, and glory of the objects which the Gospel presents to his new-born affections, than he is directly, or by just inference from the course of instruction, made to feel in danger if he yields to the power of that vision, to the absorbing emotions of the heart, to that transforming spiritual influence, the mode, or philosophy of which is one of the thousand things in controversy ; and he is painfully driven to turn his eye, and yield his attention, to the cold, cheerless, barren subjects of speculative theology, sectarian

distinctions, and the category of religious tactics. He is to obtain through these mediums whatever light he enjoys or reflects. His heart is confined and smothered, by the very instruments which are intended to excite its action; it is, as it were, incased in the thick folds of theory, speculation, technicality, mode and form, as the Chinese glaze over their earthen images with an unyielding and durable compound. And now that the well-springs of life and action are sealed; now that those powerful emotions and supreme affections of the heart, from which obedience in the outward conduct proceeds, are checked and repressed; now that the native spiritual influence of Christianity, instead of being permitted to become the law of the mind, superceding all other influences, and ruling all the sources of action, is subjected to an artificial system of theory and speculation, is it any wonder, that the practical exhibitions of this religion, of its pure spirit, its humility, its benevolence, its forbearance, its amiableness, its universal and surpassing loveliness, should not be such as to put an end to all doubt of its genuineness and efficacy, all question of its reality and blessedness, all difficulty of distinguishing its radiance from false lights, and all pretence for depending for its support or defence on any thing but its own simple truths and the co-operation of the Holy Spirit?

Under this system, when the church is by its leaders thought to be in danger, not from vice and immorality, but from error in speculation, error touching the construction of something in the symbol of doctrine or the principles of ecclesiastical government, one of the first things to be done is—*what?* To repent and do the first works, and return to the fountain and source of light? Quite otherwise. It is to draw all possible attention to the written symbol or standard, as though a speculative conformity with that, as the respective parties construe it, were the main thing, and all variance of opinion, even respecting the latest and most subtle distinctions, were the highest offence, demanded an exclusion from all confidence, and merited condign punishment. Pride, selfishness and passion now have scope for their indulgence, under the cloak, and in the abused and insulted name of religion. Piety stands abashed. Love, humility, meekness, gentleness, forbearance, compassion, kindness, joy and peace disappear, while their place is occupied by the seven spirits of contention.

On the scheme of maintaining Christianity by intellectual efforts on the fields of ecclesiastical, philosophical and doctrinal controversy, the door of dissention is alway kept wide open, and the same pride, ambition and other passions are appealed to, and there is the same tendency to division and strife, as in politics and false systems of religion. Books, therefore, on all sides of every question which the wit of man has been able to suggest, have been and still are constantly increasing. At the same time it is apparent that the learned terms, and incredible masses of lumber which this method has accumulated, have no hold on the common mind, and neither directly nor indirectly exert any more influence on the mass of mankind, than the rolls of Pompeii, or the hieroglyphics of Egypt: and hence the facility and success with which infidelity, fanaticism and delusion have so long roamed over the vast field of human ignorance and depravity.

How on this scheme can it be accounted for, that Christianity has always flourished and triumphed most, when so administered and so circumstanced, as to appear contemptible to the learning, philosophy, wisdom and power of the world? and when utterly bereft of all hope of favour from them, subjected to their frowns, and driven to depend exclusively on God? Did the faith of miracles at the beginning stand in place of our shield of polemics and controversy? Did the resistless sword of Nero excuse the church from an intellectual war? Was the Apostolic church in the valleys of Piedmont preserved by miracle, or by the same humble instrumentality, and the same divine influence and protection, as in the primitive age?

Let the reader, with a full view of the nature of Christianity, its divinity, its proper sphere, and its complete adaptation to its object, refer to the history of events in the theological and ecclesiastical world of Protestantism; examine a list of what are called theological books, or such as are deemed desirable and necessary in a theological library; consider the systems of theological education especially in Europe, and the nature of ministerial labour; and to avoid uncharitable censures, let all the exceptions which any one may find reason to make, and all the good which has been done, be allowed, and the most ample folds of all charity be thrown over all those individuals who with honest hearts have wasted their lives in building up and defending the

mere scaffolding of their systems ; and let him candidly inquire what have been the results of this method of propagating and maintaining Christianity ; what is the actual state of religion and of the churches, in those countries where the experiment was commenced, and where it has been most fully tried ? What in short under this system is the type of a minister ? With respect to those countries at least, may it not be said, that a Protestant minister is a man specially educated and trained to defend the ecclesiastical and theological system of his sect, first against all other Protestant denominations, and then against all the errors of the rest of the world ?

Such a minister suggests the idea of a man who should undertake to construct a building for religious meetings, and in order to prepare himself for the work, should study the civil law, the theory of architecture, and the method of self-defence ; and as a practical mechanic should learn to use only the rule and the smoothing plane, and know nothing of the axe, the saw, the chisel, the hammer, or any other implement. He would thus be qualified to sketch a plan of the proposed building, and to explain and defend his theory and all his rights ; and supposing the necessary timber to be brought to the proper locality, he might in course of time make some impression on it with his smoothing plane, and probably fit some pieces for their place in his edifice ; but most of his materials would perish before he would effect his object. Should several different persons, similarly qualified, undertake to co-operate in constructing the same building, and should they disagree as to the architectural plan, and employ themselves in controversy, first about their own, and then with the world at large touching the plan of all other buildings, the illustration would perhaps be more complete.

There has been a shifting of scenes, a change of tactics, from time to time, but the great evils which have been assailed by this array of effort have not been subverted.— Would that it might be seen, that the means employed had no tendency to work success, and never even in appearance had any success, except as death cleared the field of particular enemies, and perseverance worried out others, or the taste and fashion of the times demanded new subjects, and new modes of contention. This partizan warfare and single combat of intellectual and moral gladiators may, with respect to the

mountains of error in question, be fitly compared to the case of a civil engineer, who should attempt to subvert a material mountain by the fulminations of his science and oratory, instead of engaging with the humble labour of the people to undermine it.

This system is every way at variance with the genius of the Gospel, and instead of working the effects which Christianity is designed to produce, it first of all leads the minds of men away from those simple truths by the instrumentality of which their sanctification is effected. It is essentially a speculative system, and demands attention to matters which are but remotely and circumstantially connected with the subject of religion. This is doubtless more especially the case when the storm of controversy rages with greatest violence. Then succeed all sorts of fanaticism, "all monstrous, all prodigious things," as the excitement spreads among the common people. In calmer times, the supercilious pride of learning takes a more stately and luxurious seat; while the plodding dullness of pedantry busies itself, like the artizans of a German toy shop, in giving new shapes and colours to old materials, serving up to the weary, fickle appetite of effeminate curiosity and pompous egotism, an endless assortment of criticisms, comments, conceits and quidities. Religion is now covered with heaps of rubbish, which even the initiated can penetrate only by lives of study, working their obscure and devious way through the confusion of dead and foreign tongues.

Need we look to the father-land of the Reformation exclusively, to justify what has now been said? Does not the system tend the same way everywhere? May we not see nearer home a growing tendency to follow in the same steps, cherish the same spirit, teach the same things, impart the same wares, and adopt the same fashions?

Besides the alleged dependence on human learning, much might be affirmed to the same purpose of the forms of religious worship, and the appendages and worldly alliances of Christianity. How much reliance, for example, has been placed in some countries on the secular and political advantages of a connexion of church and state? and, generally, what dependence has been felt on the style and accommodations of the buildings appropriated to public worship? The feeling is common that a tasteful and attractive style of architecture, and a show of comfort and elegance is neces-

sary to conciliate the favourable opinions of worldly persons, make Christianity respectable in the eyes of the world, and give it popular influence.

Rightly viewed, the Gospel, instead of being commended by these circumstantial appendages, which the magicians, astrologers and soothsayers of paganism can imitate and surpass, would better commend itself by its spirit, its works of love, and its outward tokens of the humility which it so prominently inculcates.

Should any one imagine that the preceding observations are intended to cast contempt upon learning, or to imply that ministers have no need of sound education, mental discipline, and habits of thought and reflection, he would be quite mistaken. With theological learning in its proper sphere and applied to its proper objects, there is no more occasion of controversy than with mechanics or agriculture ; but let it not usurp the place or office of Christianity ; let not the metaphysics or philosophy of religion be substituted for the Gospel. Scholastic learning has no business in the pulpit. And, judging from experience, even if employed on the external evidences, philosophy and polemics of religion, or in the hermeneutics, the dialectics, or any other of its numberless ramifications, it may as often obscure and mystify, as render more evident the light within. The facts, assumptions, testimonies, doctrines, precepts, and sanctions of the Gospel, in their adaption to the heart and conscience, their power to produce conviction, and their tendency to reform and purify, are as much superiour to any of the forms or applications of human learning, as heaven is to earth. Let ministers be educated, not in speculation or controversy, not to furnish them with artificial instruments for their work, but in order to the best use and exertion of their faculties as pastors and teachers ; let them attain a clear and comprehensive knowledge of Christianity, but in teaching it, leave all extraneous matters out of view, and adhere to the simple method of its founder. And as for learning, profound biblical and theological learning, let such and so many men be set apart, and by common consent devoted to it, in each country, as the interests of the church demand, or as those interests will permit, without a misapplication of any of the time or talents required for the practical application of Christianity. For ministers generally to devote themselves at pleasure to the pursuits of learning, can be no more right, than it

would be for them to apply themselves to other extraneous pursuits.

In the apostolic age all dependence on human learning was disavowed and rejected—all use of learned language, and imitation of the reigning fashion of oratory, and all pride, pomp and show in externals, was carefully avoided.

The facts, precepts and doctrines of the Gospel were revealed in the simplest language, and men ignorant of the learning and philosophy of the day, were peculiarly adapted to teach the Gospel to others,—1st, because they would deliver it in the same simple phrase and manner in which they received it; 2d, because from the state, the associations and sympathies of their own minds, they were qualified to fall in with, and avail themselves of the thoughts and feelings existing in the minds of the people; 3d, because the efficacy of the Gospel under their administration was in no hazard of being ascribed to any other than the divine influence.

Hence the method by which our Saviour taught them to instruct others. He went about through all the villages preaching, that is talking to, and conversing with, all who would attend. He joined individuals and companies in their journeys, in the fields, and on the water, engaged in their secular employments; and availing himself of the knowledge they possessed, and the course of thoughts to which they were accustomed, he engrafted his instructions on their cherished feelings and associations, and by narratives, parables, and similes, suggested by the objects immediately in their view, held up before their minds those strong and vivid pictures of the things of his kingdom, which are transmitted to us in the brief story of his mission.

Paul, whatever might have been the use of his previous learning, in his relation to the Jews and their economy, imitated this example in his preaching to the Gentiles. He says to the Greeks of Corinth, "Christ sent me to preach the Gospel, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect; for the preaching of the cross is to them that perish, foolishness, but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.—God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and low things of the world, and things

which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are ; that no flesh should glory in his presence.—And I, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God ; for I determined not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and fear, and much trembling, and my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the spirit and of power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men but in the power of God.—I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase.—We are labourers together with God. Ye are God's husbandry ; ye are God's building." Again : " I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the Gospel's sake, that I may be partaker thereof with you.—I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection ; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away."

The example of the apostles and first teachers of Christianity most clearly indicates as proper to a minister, besides a just knowledge of the Gospel, a spirit of supreme self-devotement to its service, and of self-denial with respect to all other objects ; an aptness to teach, comprising a practical knowledge of human nature, a knowledge of the susceptibilities, affections, passions, habits of thought, sentiments and prejudices of men, a capacity to gain their confidence, win their attention, conciliate their regard, and convey to their minds the simple, persuasive, and affecting truths of Christianity. And in the exercise of their office it is clearly indicated, that they should in their temper and conduct exemplify its spirituality, purity, humility, inoffensiveness, impartiality and universal benevolence ; that they should, at whatever personal sacrifice and self-denial, adapt themselves to the state of mind and the circumstances of the people, avoiding in their temper, manners and habits, every thing, even things in themselves indifferent, which might offend, alienate or prejudice the weakest mind, obscure their exhibitions of the Gospel or hinder its success, and that their engrossing and chief business from day to day should be that of teaching, warning and exhortation, in conformity

with the command of Christ, "go teach—disciple, all nations—every creature."

Perhaps some reader may be inclined to suppose, that because there were no books or means of instruction in general use in our Saviour's time, and no sufficient places for large assemblies to meet on the Sabbath day, to hear sermons, his method and that of the apostles, of outdoor, personal and family instruction, was very proper and very necessary; but not so in the present age of schools, books, and church edifices. Shallow as this view of the case is, it has probably satisfied many a one to waste his life in worse than monkish indolence, dreaming over the trash and gossip of the day, and being in earnest only on such themes as eating, drinking, sleeping, and being clothed, while nine out of ten of the human race, whatever their schools and books might teach, knew nothing, nay, never so much as heard of the Gospel, and not a small proportion of the most favoured communities, in the midst of the greatest abundance of Bibles and other books, had no idea of the method of salvation, nor any sense of its importance to themselves.

The method of our Saviour and his apostles is founded in the nature of man, in his susceptibilities, affections, and conscience; and while the race continue to bring the same nature and qualities into the world with them, as heretofore, it will be just as applicable and as necessary, as at any former period.

The absurdity of supposing that the knowledge and influence of the Gospel can be imparted to all the individuals of any community, without the diligent use of that method, may be illustrated by supposing that a schoolmaster, being engaged to instruct an hundred children of five years old and upwards, in the alphabet, spelling, reading, and the various branches of a common education, should attempt to accomplish his object, by delivering a course of weekly lectures, addressed indiscriminately to the whole school, instead of dividing them into proper classes, and devoting himself to the constant, laborious, daily task of teaching each individual and each class separately.

Surely, words need not be multiplied upon this subject. If ministers will occasionally drop their books and papers, and look out from their comfortable and pleasant libraries upon the condition of the people around them, they will discover where the difficulty lies. Let them consider how

small a number out of one or two thousand residing nearest to them, have been brought under the influence of the Gospel; how small a proportion are regularly present at public worship; how few even of the adults, to say nothing of the children, usually understand or give any earnest attention to the sermons which are addressed to them; to what proportion of the hearers the sermons have no appropriateness; how little influence of the public services extends beyond the hour or the place in which they are performed. Let them minutely survey the state of those who seldom or never hear preaching, the vagrant, uncatechised children, the reckless youth, and the various groups of poor, infirm, ignorant, misled, vicious, sick, without hope and without God in the world; and then consider what is the nature of their labours? what are their discouragements? what is it that undermines their health and wears them out?—and let them seriously bring it home to themselves to perceive and feel how very limited and meagre is the effect of their personal agency and influence in a course of years, even supposing them to be cheered once and again by a day of Pentecost; and finally, let them lay it to heart how little three quarters of the people around them are much the better for their agency, talents, and sacred office.

Let them also contemplate the prospects of Christianity; its prospects of perpetual and universal controversy on the present plan of promoting and maintaining it; its prospects here and in other Protestant countries, in relation to Popery, and all the forms of error, fanaticism and delusion, without and within; and its prospects in relation to the myriads of the heathen world, who have not in eighteen hundred years so much as heard of its existence.

And let them glance at the prospects of society in respect to social order and domestic quiet, virtue, security and happiness. All experience admonishes us that mankind in the enjoyment of liberty, in proportion as they are unblest and uncontrouled by the influence of moral causes, become impatient of all social and legal restraint, insensible to the value of their blessings and advantages, ungrateful, supremely selfish, and hardened in depravity. This downward course of licentiousness is accelerated by the growing and resistless force of numbers; it quickly bursts the feeble barriers which oppose it, sets law at defiance, renders life, as well as property, insecure, and inevitably ends in despotism:

despotism with its iron rod, its intolerance, and all its known and dreadful evils, is welcomed by the wisest and best, at the hands of military heroes or aspiring demagogues, as a refuge from anarchy. There is no security for any community against this course of things, there are no adequate means of security, man's wisdom has devised none, experience furnishes none, God has provided none,—except the Gospel. Christianity, and that alone, furnishes the means, and is adequate to the end. No other religion, no system of philosophy or politics, no combination of reason, interest, imposture and superstition, ever has, or ever can reach the seat of the disease, much less cure it. The roots and germs of the disorder are in the heart, and all other remedies besides that which Christianity offers, do but increase the evil. But this remedy neither is, nor was designed, nor can in the nature of things be effectual, any more than a prescription of medicine to a community infected with the plague, except it be applied to individual cases.

But can ministers of the Gospel obviate the difficulty? Can they supply the needful instruction, and interpose the requisite instrumentality. As surely as Christianity is of God, and comprises the means of enlightening and saving the world. There is piety, knowledge, and talent enough in the ministry, and in the church, if employed as in the first age, to impart the essential truths of the Gospel to every family on earth within a short period. Nor is it necessary that ministers should, as men and Christians, be equal to apostles, to effect this; nor to such reformed doctors as Baxter, though a few such might sooner change the face of the world. But it is necessary, that, humbly depending on God alone for success, they should, as his servants, devote themselves to the labour of teaching the essential truths of the Gospel privately, and in the family, as well as from the pulpit, at the same time availing themselves of all possible aid from the prayers and co-operation of the church.

Were ministers, having acquired a suitable education, to devote themselves, the chief part of every day, to the instruction of individuals and families, and to the cultivation and exercise of those gifts and graces, and those habits of benevolence, self-denial, and labour, which the object requires, they surely might, by their own direct efforts, and the subordinate assistance of the laity, bring the light and influence of the Gospel to bear on the minds of several

thousand times as many people as they can on the plan generally pursued.

In this case, the whole life of a Christian pastor would not be required for the instruction, by weekly discourses, of a few persons, who could come at once within the sound of his voice. By his familiar intercourse with the people, and his knowledge of their religious wants, by his personal influence and example, by removing their prejudices, resolving their doubts, and gaining their confidence, by enlisting their sympathies, and awakening their hopes, by constantly plying the means of direct instruction and persuasion both privately and publicly, and by directing the efforts of all those who were capable of teaching in Sunday Schools, and assisting the common object in various ways, he might indefinitely widen the sphere of his influence. Nor would any disorders or difficulties result from such broad-cast efforts; for so certainly as he accomplished his object, and to whatever extent he gained the attention and confidence of the people, the softening, matchless influence of the Gospel itself would fall upon their minds. This instrumentality, brought into contact with men's minds, is provided, designed, and adapted, by the Divine wisdom, to supersede other influences, and to restrain, reform and sanctify. And why should it be doubted but that the same effect which is now so conspicuous in the case of the few upon whom this influence is constantly exerted, would be co-extensive with any enlarged application of the same means.

By thus bringing the truths and sanctions of the Gospel, and its testimonials of grace and love, directly to the minds of the people, fixing them in their associations and feelings, and enforcing them by example, they would exert a mighty and growing influence. Religion would be regarded as the one, chief, all-important concern, both for the life that now is, and that which is to come. Levity and vice would be checked. The people would feel that they have souls, and that their eternal destiny was at issue. Their attention would be fixed on those plain and unquestionable truths of Christianity, which concern each and every one personally, and not on the jargon of scholastic theology, the warfare of party zeal and passion, or the solemn trifling of the scribes and pharisees of any sect. A book of heresy or infidelity, under such circumstances, would be as harmless as a false system of arithmetic. Such association of religion with the

habitual thoughts, conversation, and employments of the people, renewed from day to day, and cemented by their mutual sympathies, affections, prayers and hopes, would bring their temporal and worldly concerns to a due subordination, and shield and fortify them against counteracting influences, against the efforts of heretics and fanatics, and the contagion of enthusiasm and delusion. This is what men need, and what the infinite bounty and love of God has provided for them, to engage, controul and purify their thoughts, to assuage their insupportable afflictions, to satisfy the deep and secret yearnings of their hearts, to deliver them from the yoke of sin and Satan, to raise their minds from earth to heaven, to fill them with love, joy, peace and hope, and to quench the terrors of death and the grave.

By such teaching and training, men come to feel their dependence, and to recognize the hand of God in his works, and in his providence; their pride, stupidity, and unthankfulness are rebuked; the all-pervading presence and agency of their constant preserver and benefactor, becomes familiar to their minds; and they are awakened to the claims of love, gratitude, and universal obedience. They become conscientious, principled, virtuous, orderly, useful, happy members of society, blest in their families, and in all their relations.

Among the numerous and unquestionable benefits to be expected from this method of Christian intercourse and instruction, those which respect the duties and privileges of the sacred day, claim to be particularly referred to. The use of this method would signally tend to prepare both ministers and people for the exercises of social and public worship, and to secure a general and regular attendance. If the daily routine of private teaching rendered the people less dependent on laboured discourses for their instruction, they would hear more simple and familiar ones with tenfold interest; and if the minister studied books somewhat less, he would learn more of the character, state, and spiritual wants of his flock, the operations of grace, the transcendent excellency and power of the Gospel, and the practical value and use of his gifts, talents, and personal influence. His speech and his preaching, would proceed from the fulness of his heart. There would be abroad, among the people, a common religious sentiment and feeling. The Lord's day would be hallowed in their associations and affections.

They would meet in the solemn assembly, not as a mere formal custom, not to see and be seen of each other, not to gratify an idle curiosity in hearing and criticising a literary essay, not to pass a weary, irksome, sleepy hour, not merely to be instructed and gratified; but first, and chiefly, to worship, praise, and honour their God and Saviour, and mingle their hearts and voices in the offices of devotion; and in connexion therewith to hear the gracious words of his own dictation and love, and to behold in the testimonies of his grace, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, that they might be changed into the same image.

The minister, in this state of things, would live in the affections of his people; they would be his joy and crown; his labours among them, and in the pulpit, would be an unfailing source of the highest interest and delight; orthodoxy, instead of floating in the brains, or raging in the passions of men, would rest in the bosom, and be guarded by the law of love. The lion and the lamb would repose together; the disorders of society would be hushed; religion would reign in the actions and employments, as well as in the hearts and devotions of men, and display in the church, and all the relations of life, its serene and heaven-born excellence.

This method would likewise promote the unity of the household of faith, which it is vain and hopeless to expect from any speculative system. This method addresses itself to the heart. It aims to produce spiritual and practical religion. It is homogeneous wherever applied. With instruction it combines example and influence; and with doctrine, mutual fellowship, prayers and good works; and lays the foundation of union in the affections, sympathies, and hopes.

Will not ministers look into their commission; and swayed by the love of Christ, rather than by the pride of learning and the canons of ecclesiastical fashion and prescription, will they not prefer the fellowship of the Great Shepherd in the humble service of teaching, watching over, and training the respective individuals and families of their flocks? Will they not make it their object to reform and save all who are within their reach, and thus staunch the fountain of those evils which ruin the souls and bodies of men, and those outward exhibitions of depravity which alms houses, prisons, locks and bars, penal laws, the sword of magistracy, education, and all the devices of human wisdom, are so incompetent to cure.

It is for them to decide. Let them well consider the tendency and fruits of the present system, and soberly calculate when, under its influence, it is likely the mass of the people, here and throughout the world, will be converted.— Let them consider how it comes under this system, that they are so generally seized with indignation and alarm when the intellects of any of their own sect are infected with error, and get out of the traces of their theory, while they slumber over the ignorance, infidelity, and impiety of the undisciplined multitude around them. Let them consider where and how that multitude are ever to be reformed, unless some untitled and unpretending servant in the kingdom and patience of Christ shall go after them, instruct, persuade and gather them into his fold.

Let them ask, whether it is right for them to lay such stress on literary acquisitions, habits of study, and talents and furniture for public speaking, in those whom they introduce into the sacred office; and to overlook comparatively those gifts and endowments which are inwrought by the Spirit of Grace? whether more good is to be contemplated from a learned, studious, aspiring, eloquent, graceful youth, than from one like Brainard on the opposite extreme of humility, self-abasement and spiritual-mindedness?

Let them ponder, whether it requires a whole life of study, with a thousand extraneous aids and helps, to understand the essential truths of the Gospel, so as to impart the knowledge of them to others; whether it is, in very deed, the Gospel which they study, or any thing and every thing else; whether all the attainments of literature and science can supply the defect of habits of patient, familiar, colloquial intercourse, sympathy, and fellowship with those to whom the Gospel is to be imparted; and whether life is so enduring and so cheap, that they can afford to spend it otherwise than in the peculiar and laborious duties of their office?

Let them go into their libraries, and see what proportion of their books are of any use in respect to the true end of their ministerial office; how many do but serve to beguile their thoughts and waste their time; how many chill their religious affections, and engage their minds on questions foreign to their proper object; how many might as well be dispensed with here, as in heaven, and would be deemed worthless trash by a heart absorbed in the love and service of God; how few besides their Bibles are worthy of their

notice, or can share their time consistently with those solemn duties upon which depends the destiny of souls.

Let them consider, too, that if any reformation takes place, it must begin with them. If the present system is persisted in, every one may judge for himself, from the experience of the last three centuries, what is likely to be the course of events in this and other parts of Christendom. No one can be at a loss to judge what is to be expected from continued controversy between different Protestant denominations, and controversial opposition to Popery, infidelity, and other forms of external error. Even should some benefit result to a portion of those who read what is published, and hear what is said, the mass of the people are not enlightened or warned against delusion: not one in ten of them are reached, be the conflict ever so sharp; and if the partisans of error can but have an unoccupied field of such extent to work in, they will have scope enough: and if by art, industry, and the deceivableness of unrighteousness, they can turn the current of ignorance and wickedness against the truths and institutions of Christianity, the combined powers of darkness will, it is to be feared, extinguish the light of truth.

If any change takes place, by which the course of religious influence and effort shall be differently directed, any change by which the Gospel shall be applied, after the primitive manner, to the people generally, and the wide field of the world be thickly sown with the seed of the word,—any change by which a just exhibition of Christianity shall be made; it must be wrought, not by ignorant pretenders, irresponsible quacks, fickle enthusiasts, puerile novices, visionary speculatists, or disorderly fanatics, but by sound, duly educated, and duly authorized ministers.

But what will it avail even for such to lament the desecration of the Lord's day, and inculcate its due observance, if they fail most scrupulously to hallow it themselves under all circumstances, at home and abroad? What will it avail if they periodically urge their people to be prayerful and heavenly minded, to subordinate the world to their eternal interests, to be fruitful of good works, and to let their lights shine before others, if they themselves who are devoted as Nazarites to God, are wanting in respect to any thing which they inculcate? What will all their elaborate preaching avail against the more constant, more urgent and more skil-

ful influence of the world, of unsubdued passions, and the devices of the adversary, unless their public efforts are followed up by private teaching and exhortation, and by a daily exhibition in their intercourse with the people, of their own blameless example? To what purpose will be any alarm they may feel on account of heresies, vice, social and political disorder, mobs and riots, if they do nothing more than has heretofore been done, to extend the influence of moral restraints, by teaching and applying the Gospel to the young, the unlettered, and as far as possible, to every individual?

There is balm in Gilead, and a Physician there. But who can, or ought to apply the remedy, besides the ministers of the Gospel, whose office it is, and who are authorized and set apart for this express purpose? In short, what is to be expected or hoped, in the best view that can be taken of the present state of things in respect to religion, even in this favoured land, unless God's method of enlightening, reforming, and saving men, be duly applied; unless the means which he has provided, and with which he co-operates, are universally employed?

When our Lord ascended up on high, he received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them. And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Now, God dwells with men by his Spirit. The agency of the Spirit in giving efficacy to the Gospel, and perfecting the object for which Christ came into the world, is the great promise of the New Testament. On this, all the success and all the hopes of Christianity depend. But it is necessary that this dependence should be recognized, acknowledged, and felt; that the Gospel should be so ministered that the excellency of the power by which its effects are produced may be seen and known to be of God, and not of men; that the preaching and inculcation, in whatever way, of its truths, should be regarded as a simple instrumentality, like that of planting and watering seeds of grain, employed, in conformity with the Divine appointment, in perfect dependence on the co-operation of this superiour agency. All reliance on any thing else is wholly repugnant to the subject. All pomp and circumstance, all show of learning and

subtily, all pride and adulation, all strife and contention, in this matter, is as much out of place as insensibility, indolence, negligence, selfishness or error. Where these things are, there may be much to please the eye and the ear, much to quiet the consciences, and gratify the feelings of the worldly-minded, much of every thing except the presence of the Divine Spirit. Where these things are interposed, they seize the imagination, and arrest the attention, so that whatever of truth is preached becomes unfruitful. It does not take hold of the mind. The case may be compared to that of a husbandman who, before scattering his seed, should spread over the ground a thick coating of salt, or who should envelope the seed itself in some destructive composition.

The gracious presence of the Divine Spirit is to be anticipated where it is sought with cordial and intense desire, and where the proper instrumentality is employed, in perfect reliance on His influence, in a manner suitable to the weakness and insignificance of those who interpose this instrumentality, and their entire and constant dependence on Him for wisdom and grace, right apprehensions of the truth, and preservation from error; where it is employed, not with ostentation, dogmatism, or intolerance, but with meekness and fear; where the teacher feels himself to be but a worm of the dust, an earthen vessel, and is conscious of the immeasurable distance between him, as a creature ignorant and imperfect, and the glorious author and supporter of the Gospel; where it is employed under a deep conviction that it will be a savor of life, or of death, to the hearers, and that the results will depend essentially on the manner in which he executes his trust.

Solemn and momentous office! Ministers are ambassadors for Christ, commissioned to treat with guilty men in His name, proposing his terms of pardon and peace, and praying them, in his stead, to be reconciled to God. But they go under the ægis of his almighty power; and while they abide by his instructions, and devote themselves to the duties of their mission, in the spirit of perfect allegiance and perfect dependence, he will be with them, protect them, and maintain his cause. Nor will he shut them up either to gloom and discouragement, or to any earthly sources of cheerfulness and joy. He has set them an example, not indeed of seclusion and repose, but of labour, condescension,

and love, the imitation of which, while it will require their utmost diligence, the constant exercise of their best affections, and the use of all their gifts and talents, in the various walks of usefulness, will be to them an unfailing source of the purest and most exalted happiness. He went about doing good both to the souls and bodies of men, especially to the poor, ignorant, afflicted, and miserable. He calls them to follow in his steps; reminds them that it is more blessed to give than to receive; and admonishes them that the disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his Lord.

That the method which has been insisted on is no where impracticable, is evident from what Baxter was the means of accomplishing under the most discouraging circumstances, while he was emaciated and borne down by sickness and infirmity, and believed it his duty, in addition to his pastoral labours, to be constantly engaged in writing for the public.

On his first settlement at Kidderminster, which was in the disturbed and fanatical period of Cromwell, when the country was distracted with every species of political violence and religious controversy, "he found the place," according to his biographer, "like a piece of dry and barren earth, overrun with ignorance and vice. Immorality, and opposition to the Gospel, prevailed among all classes. His doctrine was unpalatable, his manner of life, and hostility to vice and irreligion in every form, still more so. But by patient continuance in well-doing, and the blessing of God on his labours, he overcame all their prejudices, and produced universal love and veneration, and the place became rich in all the fruits of righteousness."

In his own personal narrative, after an account, among other things, of his feeble health, he says, "I shall next record, to the praise of my Redeemer, the comfortable employment and success which he vouchsafed me during my abode at Kidderminster, under all these weaknesses. And first, I will mention my employment; second, my successes; and third, those advantages by which under God they were procured."

"Before the wars, I preached twice each Lord's day; but afterwards but once, and once on every Thursday, besides occasional sermons. Every Thursday evening, my neighbours who were most desirous, and had opportunity,

met at my house, and there one of them repeated the sermon; afterwards they proposed what doubts any of them had about the sermon, or any other case of conscience, and I resolved their doubts. Last of all, I caused sometimes one and sometimes another of them to pray, to exercise them; and sometimes I prayed with them myself; which, besides singing a psalm, was all they did. Once a week, also, some of the younger sort, who were not fit to pray in so great an assembly, met among a few more privately, where they spent three hours in prayer together. Every Saturday night, they met at some of their houses, to repeat the sermon of the former Lord's day, and to pray and prepare themselves for the following day. Once in a few weeks we had a day of humiliation, on one occasion or another. Two days every week, my assistants and myself took fourteen families between us, for private catechising and conference; he going through the parish, and the town coming to me. I first heard them recite the words of the catechism, and then examined them about the sense; and, lastly, urged them, with all possible engaging reason, and vehemency, to answerable affections and practice. If any of them were stalled through ignorance or bashfulness, I forbore to press them any further to answers, but made them hearers, and either examined others, or turned all into instruction and exhortation. I spent about an hour with each family, and admitted no others to be present; lest bashfulness should make it burthensome, or any should talk of the weaknesses of others."

"Besides all this, I was forced, five or six years, by the people's necessity, to practise physic. A common pleurisy happening one year, and no physician being near, I was forced to advise them, to save their lives; and I could not afterwards avoid the importunity of the town and country round about. Because I never once took a penny of any one, I was crowded with patients."

"But all these my labours (except my private conference with the families), even preaching and preparing for it, were but my recreation, and as it were the work of my spare hours; for my writings were my chief daily labour; which yet went the more slowly on, that I never one hour had an amanuensis to dictate to, and especially because my weakness took up so much of my time. All the pains that my infirmities ever brought upon me, were never half so griev-

ous an affliction, as the unavoidable loss of time which they occasioned. I could not bear, through the weakness of my stomach, to rise before seven o'clock in the morning, and afterwards not till much later; and some infirmities I laboured under, made it above an hour before I could be dressed."

"Every first Wednesday in the month, was our monthly meeting for parish discipline; and every first Thursday of the month, was the minister's meeting for discipline and disputation."

"For ever blessed be the God of my mercies, who brought me from the grave, and gave me, after wars and sickness, fourteen years' liberty in such sweet employment! How strange, that in times of usurpation, I had all this mercy and happy freedom; when under our rightful king and governour, I, and many hundreds more, are silenced, and laid by as broken vessels, and suspected and vilified as scarce to be tolerated to live privately and quietly in the land! How mysterious that God should make days of licentiousness and disorder under an usurper, so great a mercy to me, and many a thousand more, [non-conformists under the second Charles,] who, under the lawful governours which they desired, and in the days when order is said to be restored, do sit in obscurity and unprofitable silence, or lie in prisons; while all of us are accounted as the scum, and sweepings, or off-scourings of the earth."

"I have mentioned my secret and acceptable employment; let me, to the praise of my gracious Lord, acquaint you with some of my success."

"My public preaching met with an attentive, diligent auditory. Having broke over the brunt of the opposition of the rabble before the wars, I found them afterwards tractable and unprejudiced. Before I entered into the ministry, God blessed my private conference to the conversion of some, who remain firm and eminent in holiness, to this day; but then, and in the beginning of my ministry, I was wont to number them as jewels; but since then I could not keep any enumeration of them. The congregation was usually full, so that we were fain to build five galleries after my coming thither; the church itself being very capacious, and the most commodious and convenient that ever I was in. Our private meetings also were full. On the Lord's days there was no disorder to be seen in the streets; but you might hear a hundred families singing psalms, and repeating

sermons, as you passed through them. In a word, when I came thither first, there was about one family in a street that worshipped God, and called on his name, and when I came away, there were some streets where there was not one poor family in the side that did not so; and that did not, by professing serious godliness, give us hopes of their sincerity. And in those families which were the worst, being inns and ale-houses, usually some persons in each house did seem to be religious."

"Though our administration of the Lord's Supper was so ordered as displeased many, who kept away, we had six hundred that were communicants, of whom there were not twelve that I had not good hopes of, as to their sincerity.—I hope there were also many who had the fear of God, that came not to our communion in the sacrament; some of them being kept off by husbands, by parents, by masters, and some dissuaded by men that differed from us."

"When I set upon personal conference with each family, and catechising them, there were very few families in all the town that refused to come; and those few were beggars at the town's ends, who were so ignorant that they were ashamed it should be manifest. Few families went from me without some tears, or seemingly serious promises of a godly life. Some of the poor never did competently understand the body of divinity. Some of them were so able in prayer, that very few ministers did match them in order and fulness, and apt expressions, and holy oratory, with fervency. Abundance of them were able to pray very laudably with their families, or with others. The temper of their minds, and the innocency of their lives, were much more laudable than their parts. The professors of serious godliness were generally of very humble minds, and carriage; of meek and quiet behaviour unto others; and of blamelessness and innocency in their conversation."

He then speaks of his occasional labours in other places, and his endeavours with his brethren in the ministry, of whom he says, "When I attempted also to bring them all conjointly to the work of catechising and instructing every family by itself, I found a ready consent in most, and performance in many."

"I must here, then, to the praise of my Redeemer, set up this pillar of remembrance, even to his praise who hath employed me so many years in so comfortable a work, with

such encouraging success. Oh, what am I, a worthless worm, not only wanting academical honours, but much of that furniture which is needful to so high a work, that God should thus abundantly encourage me, when the reverend instructors of my youth did labour fifty years together in one place, and could scarcely say they had converted one or two in their parishes! And the greater was the mercy, because I was naturally of a discouraged spirit; so that if I had preached one year, and seen no fruits of it, I should hardly have forborne running away, like Jonah; but should have thought that God called me not to that place."

"Having related my comfortable success in this place, I shall next tell you by what and how many advantages this was effected, under that grace which worketh by means, though with a free diversity. I do it chiefly for their sakes, who would know the means of other men's experiments, in managing ignorant and sinful parishes."

"The advantage was, that I came to a people who never had any awakening ministry before, but a few formal, cold sermons from the curate—and doing all in bodily weakness, as a dying man, my soul was the more easily brought to seriousness, and to preach as a dying man to dying men. For drowsy formality and contumaciousness, doth but stupify the hearers, and rock them asleep. It must be serious preaching, which will render men serious in hearing and obeying it."

"Another advantage which I had, was the acceptation of my person among the people. Though, to win estimation and love to ourselves only, be an end that none but proud men and hypocrites intend, yet it is most certain, that the gratefulness of the person doth ingratiate the message, and greatly prepareth the people to receive the truth."

"Another advantage which I had, was the zeal and diligence of the godly people of the place. They thirsted after the salvation of their neighbours, and were in private my assistants, and being dispersed through the town, were ready in almost all companies to repress seducing words, and to justify godliness, convince, reprove, and exhort men, according to their needs; as also to teach them how to pray; and to help them to sanctify the Lord's day. For those people who had none in their families who could pray, or repeat the sermons, went to their next neighbour's house who could do it, and joined with them; so that some of the houses of the

ablest men in each street were filled with them that could do nothing, or little, in their own."

"Their holy, humble, blameless lives, were also a great advantage to me. The malicious people could not say, your professors here are as proud and covetous as any; but the blameless lives of godly people did shame opposers, and put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, and many were won by their good conversation."

"Our unity and concord were a great advantage to us; and our freedom from those sects and heresies, with which many other places were infected."

"Our private meetings were a marvellous help to the propagating of godliness, for thereby truths that slipped away, were recalled, and the seriousness of the people's minds renewed, and good desires cherished. Their knowledge, also, was much increased by them, and the younger sort learned to pray by frequently hearing others. I had, also, the opportunity of knowing their case; for if any were touched and awakened in public, I should frequently see them drop into our private meetings. Idle meetings and loss of time were greatly prevented; and so far were we from being by this in danger of schism, or divisions, that it was the principal means to prevent them; for here I was usually present with them, answering their doubts, silencing objections, and moderating them in all."

"Another help to my success, was the small relief which my low estate enabled me to afford the poor; though the place was reckoned at near two hundred pounds per annum, there came but ninety pounds, and sometimes only eighty pounds to me. In giving the little I had, I did not enquire whether they were good or bad, if they asked relief; for the bad had souls and bodies that needed charity most. And this truth I will speak to the encouragement of the charitable, that what little money I have now by me, I got it almost all, I scarce know how, at that time when I gave most."

"Another furtherance of my work, was the books which I wrote, and gave away among them. Of some small books, I gave each family one, and of the bigger, I gave fewer; and every family that was poor, and had not a Bible, I gave a Bible to."

"God made use of my practice of physic among them also, as a very great advantage to my ministry; for they that cared not for their souls, did love their lives, and care for

their bodies ; and by this they were made almost as observant, as a tenant is of his landlord. Sometimes I could see before me in the church, a very considerable part of the congregation, whose lives God had made me the means to save, or to recover their health ; and doing it for nothing, so obliged them, that they would readily hear me."

"It was a great advantage to me, that there were, at last, few that were bad, but some of their own relations were converted. Many children did God work upon at fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen years of age ; and this did marvellously reconcile the minds of the parents, and elder sort, to godliness. They that would not hear me, would hear their own children. They that before could have talked against godliness, would not hear it spoken against it, when it was their children's case. Many who would not be brought to it themselves, were proud that they had understanding, religious children ; and we had some old persons of eighty years of age, who are, I hope, in Heaven ; and the conversion of their own children, was the chief means to overcome their prejudices, and old customs, and conceits."

"Another great help to my success, at last, was the formerly described work of personal conference with every family apart, with catechising and instructing them. That which was *spoken to them personally*, and which put them sometimes upon answers, awakened their attention, and was easier applied than public preaching, *and seemed to do much more upon them.*"

"Another advantage which I found to my success, was, by ordering my doctrine to them in a suitableness to the main end, and yet so as might suit their dispositions and diseases. The things which I daily opened to them, and with greatest importunity laboured to imprint upon their minds, were the great fundamental principles of Christianity contained in their baptismal covenant—even a right knowledge and belief of, and subjection and love to, God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; love to all men, and concord with the church, and one another. I did so daily inculcate a knowledge of God our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier ; love and obedience to God, unity with the church catholic, and love to men, and the hope of life eternal ; that these were the matter of their daily cogitations and discourses, and, indeed, their religion."

"Another thing that helped me was, my not meddling with

tithes or worldly business, whereby I had my whole time, except what sickness deprived me of, for my duty ; and my mind more free from entanglements than else it would have been ; and also, I escaped the offending of the people, and contending by any lawsuits with them. Three or four of my neighbours managed all those kinds of business, of whom I never took account ; and if any one refused to pay his tithes, if he was poor, I ordered them to forgive it him."

To these brief extracts, the addition of some remarks of Mr. Orme, in his life of their author, will doubtless be acceptable:

"The secret of his success, Baxter has disclosed to us in the most faithful and interesting manner. While we admire the grace of God, which so abundantly rested upon his labours, we cannot but notice at the same time, the extraordinary suitableness and adaptation, both of the instrument himself, and of the means which he employed, in the work he was honoured to accomplish.

"Abstracting all the temporary and local circumstances to which Baxter adverts as favourable to his success, the simplicity and intense ardour of his preaching, demand our notice. It was admirably adapted to instruct the ignorant, to rouse the careless, and to build up the faithful. He sought out acceptable words, but he had neither time nor taste for making what are called fine sermons ; he studied point, not brilliancy. His object was not to dazzle, but to convince ; not to excite admiration of himself, but to procure the reception of his message. He never aimed at drawing attention to the preacher, but always at fixing it at home, or guiding it to Christ. He never "courted a grin," when he might have "wooded a soul ;" or played with the fancy, when he should have been depicting the heart. His subjects were always the most important which can engage the attention of man,—the creed, the commandments, and the Lord's prayer—or, according to his own simple definition of them,—the things to be believed—the things to be done—and the things to be desired. These were the leading—indeed, the only topics of his ministry. Into these he entered with all the intense ardour of his acute, and deeply impressible mind. He never spoke like a man who was indifferent whether his audience felt what he said, or considered him in earnest on the subject. His eye, his action, his every word were expressive of deep and impassioned earnestness,

that his hearers might be saved. His was eloquence of the highest order; not the eloquence of nicely selected words, or the felicitous combination of terms and phrases, or the music of exquisitely balanced periods, (though these properties are frequently to be found in Baxter's discourses,) but the eloquence of the most important truths, vividly apprehended, and energetically delivered. It was the eloquence of a soul burning with ardent devotion to God, and inspired with the deepest compassion for men; on whom the powers of the worlds of darkness and of light, exercised their mighty influence; and spoke through his utterances all that was tremendous in warning, and all that was delightful in invitation and love. He was condescending to the ignorant, faithful to the self-righteous and careless, tender to the timid and afflicted; in a word, as a preacher, he became all things to all men, if, by any means, he might save some. It was impossible that such a man should labour in vain.

"Another thing which strikes us in the ministerial conduct of Baxter, was his careful avoidance of every thing which might prejudice his hearers against him, and his diligent cultivation of whatever was likely to gain their favour, or secure their impartial attention. No one could be less of a man-pleaser than he was; for apart from promoting the object of his ministry, he was regardless of human frown or favour. But he considered nothing unimportant which either stood in the way of his success, or was likely to promote it. His conduct in regard to his tithes; his remaining unmarried; his practising physic; his liberality to the poor; his distribution of books, &c., were all intended to be subservient to his great work. The gaining of souls to Christ was the only object for which he lived. Hence, amidst the seeming variety of his pursuits and engagements, there was a perfect harmony of design. His ruling and controuling principle, was the love of his Master, producing the desire of a full and faithful discharge of his duty, as his approved minister. This was the centre, around which every thing moved, and by which every thing in his circumstances and character was attracted or repelled. This gave unity to all his plans, and constituted the moral force of all his actions. It gave enlightened energy to his zeal, exquisite tenderness to his persuasions; warmth and fervency to his admonitions. It poured over all his public and private ministrations that holy unction,

which diffused its fragrance, spreading its bland and refreshing influences all around.

"A third point worthy of observation in his ministry, is, that it was not limited to the pulpit, or considered as discharged in the parlour. The blow which he aimed at the mass in public, was followed by successive strokes addressed to the individuals in private. The congregation was not permitted to forget, during the week, what they had been taught on the Sabbath. The man who would have been lost in the crowd, or who might have sheltered himself under the exceptions which belong to a general address, was singled out, convicted, and shut up to the faith, or left to bear the stings of an instructed and alarmed conscience. The young were instructed and led on; the strong were taught to minister to the weak; and the prayers of many a holy band, at once strengthened the hands of their minister, and "girded each other for the race divine." This was truly making full proof of his ministry, and promoting in his congregation the grand objects and aims of the fellowship of Christianity.

"When we thus connect the public talents and private character of Baxter, the energy and point of his pulpit addresses, with the assiduousness, the perseverance, and the variety of his other labours; his devotion to God, his disinterested love to men; what he was as a *pastor*, with all that he was as a *preacher*; we cease to wonder at the effects which he produced. No place could long resist such a train and style of aggression. All people must feel the force of such a moral warfare as that which he waged. There are few individuals who could escape without being wounded, or conquered by such an assailant. In comparison with him, how few are there even among the faithful ministers of Christ, who can think of themselves, or their labours, with satisfaction? Yet, was there nothing in Baxter but what the grace and power of God can do for others. There was something in his exertions almost superhuman; yet he seemed to accomplish all with a considerable degree of ease and comfort to himself. He never seems to have been bustled, but he was always busy; and thus he found time for all he had to do, while he employed that time in the most profitable manner. We have only to find an increase of such ministers in the church of Christ, and who will employ the same kind of means, in order to the accomplish-

ment in any place, of effects that will not shrink from a comparison with Kidderminster itself in all its glory.

"The effects of Baxter's ministry in Kidderminster, were lasting, as well as extensive. He frequently refers to his beloved flock, long after he had left them, in terms of the warmest affection. Nor did the effects of his exertions expire with that generation. Mr. Fawcett, who abridged the "Saint's Rest," in 1759, says, "that the religious spirit thus happily introduced by Baxter, is yet to be traced, in the town and neighbourhood, in some degree." He represents the professors of that place, as "possessing an unusual degree of candour, and friendship for each other;" thus evincing, 'that Kidderminster had not totally lost the amiable spirit it had imbibed more than a century before.'

---

## ART. II. GIBBON'S INFIDELITY.

By REV. LEONARD WITHINGTON, Newbury, Mass.

BISHOP BURNET, in his preface to the history of his own time, informs us, that he set about that work with the greatest care; "for," says he, "I reckon a lie in history, to be as much a greater sin, than a lie in common discourse, as the one is likely to be more lasting, and more generally known, than the other." Every impartial reader must agree in the justice of this remark. The historian is a witness in a most important court—implicitly sworn, as he hopes for help from God, and reputation from posterity, to deliver the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It was a sad day for the interests of knowledge, when the maxim was introduced, that history must be made subservient to some other design. Sallust mentions it as one of his qualifications for the task he had undertaken, that he was free from the spirit of party. In modern times, facts have often as little to do with the writer's representations, as the canvas has with the effect of the images and the colouring of the painter's picture.

Infidelity is such a dry and sterile thing, that unless it comes forth as the appendage of some superiour design, it

can hardly be made interesting to the reflecting part of mankind. It must be grafted on a root, and supported by a trunk, not its own. Of the authors, who have written professedly in behalf of infidelity, few have survived the dust and the cobwebs of some vast library, where they are kept, like serpents and monsters in bottled spirits, only to show what prodigies nature has bred, and make us thankful that such beings, though horrible, are but rare.

I venture to say, that no splendour of diction, no ornaments of fancy, no prodigality of genius, can ever make a book popular and lasting, whose sole object is to disprove the fundamental principles of the Christian system.

Bolingbroke was certainly a fine writer, and one of the best masters of the English language; yet, who reads his philosophical works? They are only consulted by a few restless young men in our colleges, on the same principle that the wife, in the tale of Bluebeard, looked into the fatal chamber, merely because it was forbidden.

Infidels have recently become conscious of this. Knowing that their system is not like a tree, which can stand erect by its own strength; but is like a vine, which cannot grow upright, unless it has something to creep upon, they have made their infidelity subordinate to some better interest. One mixes it in a system of geology; another makes it the moral of a poem; a third teaches it in a work on medicine; and a fourth weaves it into a commentary on the Bible itself. Some accessory interest must always be brought in to arrest the attention, and bribe the feelings of mankind. It is a plant which can never grow, but under the shelter of a nobler shade.

One of the additional interests which have been brought in, of late years, to support it, is *history*. By some strange fatality, modern history has fallen into the hands of infidels. The fact, it must be allowed, was very different with ancient history. With the exception of Tacitus, I do not remember one of the ancient historians, who does not lean to the side of credulity, on the subject of the popular religion. Herodotus is a perfect old woman. Xenophon is as full of omens and prognostics, as Pagan priests could wish; and all of them, from the warmest conviction, join to support the religion of their country. And even in modern times, previous to the last century, the historian has generally been on the side of Revelation. Sir Walter Raleigh is said to have been

a free-thinker; but nothing of it appears in his history. Lord Clarendon, though a statesman and a tory, talks in a style which would now be thought rather canting; and it is impossible to read the preface of Burnet, without believing that he was a good man, in the evangelical sense of that expression.

But since these days, historians have sustained a very different character, and have written from a very different design. Bayle published his dictionary as a manual of skepticism; though on the whole the fairest of all the unbelieving tribe, from his frigid indifference. Voltaire after some interval followed; and Hume and Gibbon bring up the rear. Knowing that all men read history, knowing too that the negative discoveries of the unbeliever can interest very few; they have combined two designs into one, and have mingled the poison of infidelity in the streams of the purest knowledge.

Hume and Gibbon were however very different men. The one was vastly superiour in genius; the other, in patient application and diligent research. Hume has a style, so simple, so elegant, so easy, always rising with the interest of his story, and then sinking into the tranquillity of calm narrative, that his sentiments fall on the mind like sunlight, which always reveals the object, and never fatigues the eye. Gibbon's more ambitious style meets the mind like the blaze of some splendid conflagration, artificially beautiful and painfully brilliant. We begin to read with pleasure, but are fatigued and overpowered before the chapter is closed.

Hume was by nature and education a sophist. But his mind was far clearer, because superior to that of Gibbon; whose obliquities distorted his very language. Nothing can be more just than his criticism on his own style. "The most serious defect of my Essay (i. e. the first work he published, but which contained no defect which did not, in a degree, adhere to every subsequent performance) is a kind of obscurity and abruptness, which always fatigues, and may often elude the attention of the reader. \* \* Alas! how fatal has been the imitation of Montesquieu!" "But this obscurity sometimes proceeds from a mixture of light and darkness in the author's mind; from a partial ray which strikes upon an angle, instead by spreading itself over a surface."

Since so many historians have been advocates of infidelity, it may be proper to inquire, whether there is any thing

in the study of history which tends to unbelief. The answer to this question depends, in some degree, on the position on which the historian stands. In ancient times, it would seem that historical studies had no such tendency; for we have already seen, that most of the early historians, so far as supernatural power was concerned, erred on the side of credulity, and not of unbelief. But in modern times the effect is different. I am inclined to think, that since the corruption of Christianity and the rise of the enormous fabric of Roman power, the study of ecclesiastical antiquity has some tendency to make the mind skeptical. Speaking from my own experience, I have never had so many infidel thoughts pass through my mind, as when reading the histories of Socrates and Sozomen, together with some of the writings of the more credulous fathers. They generate a skepticism, which nothing but a recurrence to the pure and holy oracles of original Revelation can cure.

You read in ecclesiastical history, miracle after miracle; miracles of presumption, and miracles of folly, miracles wrought by the bones of a dead saint, to clothe with flesh the bones of a fat monk. In reading the history of these miracles, which require the most boundless credulity to believe them, your first thought is, that all miracles must be the delusion of human weakness, played on by designing power;—and the Gospel begins to suffer, because it is found in such company. But a little further reflection soon convinces an impartial man, that the first and later miracles have an entirely different character, and stand in a very different relation to human duty and happiness. It seems to have been ordained by the providence of God, that both the Old Testament and New, should be surrounded by a mass of rubbish and folly, in order to force our minds to discrimination, and compel us to separate the chaff from the wheat. The Old Testament comes down to us from antiquity, surrounded with the comments of the Talmud and Mishna; and the New comes incumbered with all the credulous comments of the fathers. But although both these accompaniments bear about the same proportion to the purity of the sacred history, as the weeds which grow on the borders of a field, bear to the wheat, and other grain, which they inclose, —nevertheless, to a heart of a sensual and material turn, careless and indifferent about religion, all this presents an excuse for not seeing the evidences of the Gospel. To a man

half blind already, a few clouds over the sun will be an apology for not beholding his light.

There is another effect of reading early ecclesiastical history: the follies of antiquity present much food for contempt and ridicule; and it is well known, that the satirist is never more delighted, than when he is demolishing what has been held sacred in the eyes of mankind. Now, though I would not say, with Hobbes, that all laughter is founded on pride, yet I am afraid that the laughter of a satirist is commonly allied to that passion. To be always trampling, with scorn and contempt, on things once deemed sacred, is not the best way to prepare our minds for things really so. Ecclesiastical history, it must be acknowledged by the warmest Christians, provokes some passions not the most favourable to the reception of the Gospel. This is especially true of the history of that long period from the second century down to the Reformation.

There is another very subtle influence exerted by these studies, in prejudicing the mind against the Gospel. There is a silent change constantly going on in the meaning of words, by which the reader finds himself unconsciously brought among very different objects, while he has been wholly unconscious of any change. This is true in all history; we find the best terms melting away, like snow banks at the bottom. When Rome expelled her kings, the word *liberty* meant what that sacred term ought to mean; and when in the days of Coriolanus, *tribunes* of the people were first instituted, they were real guardians of the people's rights. But how was it in aftertimes? It was by the abused name of liberty, that Cesar defeated the influence of the Senate, and by the help of a tribune he established his despotic power. The fact is, in all history, the words sink away under us; and are always undermined by a subterranean current, which leaves the superstructure, but destroys the foundation of the fabric, while we are tempted to consider it as always the same. *Repentance* and *faith*—what different meanings did they convey in the second and third century, from what they did in the mouths of the first preachers of the Gospel? Thus the whole system is overspread by a mist, too thin to be traced, but sufficient to alter the proportion of all we see. As we look at the very stars of heaven, through the medium of our grosser atmosphere, and the refraction alters their form and place; so the very terms

of Revelation, to one who has involved himself in the mists of ecclesiastical history, become waning and changeful, so that the wisdom of God is seen through the follies and perversions of some of the most doting of mankind.

In one word, *Popery* has been the origin of almost all the infidelity that has afflicted the world. And the outlines of this great system of delusion were drawn much sooner than Protestants have been willing to suppose. It is a melancholy truth, that some of the earliest of the fathers, and perhaps all after the period of Justin Martyr, lend their authority to certain false principles, on which the whole foundation of Popery is built. We have the testimony of St. Paul, (see 2 Thess. ii. 7,) that *the mystery of iniquity doth already work*, that is, the foundations of some great delusion and apostasy were already laid. It is one of the inscrutable wonders of Divine Providence, that the rivers of life, gushing so pure from its fountain, should so soon be polluted,—that so large a part of the world should be left so long to the gloom of Paganism, and the rest should be given up to an error, which had little else to gild it but the name of Christianity.

However, one thing may be said to reduce the difficulty. The view we have of the first ages of Christianity, is derived, to a considerable extent, from the character of the particular age when Christianity became predominant—the age of Constantine. Then they undertook to set up a standard of taste, to determine what writings to preserve, what events to record, whose memory to embalm, and whose character to adorn as confessors and saints. The writings *preserved*, are not always a specimen of the writings which once *existed*. I have always felt a hope, indeed, there is some reason to believe, that some pious effusions of greater simplicity than those of Tertullian and Cyprian existed; though the bad judgment of later ages, not knowing their value, left them to perish. And as to events, it is in Christianity as in politics, the most virtuous times, are those of which least is said. When the river swells with the melting snows, throws up the breaking ice, sweeps away the bridges, and desolates its banks, every newspaper records it; but, when it glides along its summer channel, with a refreshing stream, reflecting the bending trees, and diffusing life and gladness wherever it flows, we admire, but say nothing.

Thus, there is probably something in the history of the ages intervening between the purity and corruption of Christianity, calculated to confirm the infidelity of a mind not receiving its authority, and not loving its truths.

It will be observed that I do not say, that a careful study of history, in the extensive sense of that word, is conducive to skepticism; but in the peculiar position in which a modern writer may look back to the rise of Christianity, through ages infected by its grossest corruptions, an unspiritual eye may confound the darkness with the light, as a traveller may so place himself, that trees and mountains may partially intercept his view of the sun.

Gibbon has written his own life, and freely recorded the process by which he became a skeptick. It must be confessed that his lot was unfortunate. Born in an affluent and pleasure-seeking family, who knew little of Christianity except the name, he was sent at an early age to Oxford, with a very superficial knowledge of classical literature. Here, to use his own melancholy language—"without a single lecture, either public or private, either Christian or Protestant, without any academical subscription, without any Episcopal confirmation, I was left by the dim light of my catechism, to grope my way to the chapel and communion table, where I was admitted, without a question how far, or by what means, I might be qualified to receive the sacrament." His studies were neglected, and not a single tutor, or officer of college, undertook to direct his literary or religious pursuits. He saw, according to his own account, in the Doctors of the University, the most unedifying examples; and conscious, that wherever truth might be, the spirit of religion was not there, he was led to seek it in another communion. In this state, while suffered to run wild, some Popish books fell into his hands; he read them; became a convert, and was privately reconciled to the Romish church. The gates of Oxford were of course closed on the young apostate, and his father sent him to study with a Protestant clergyman, in the south of France, where the most untiring polemic industry was used to bring him back to the Protestant faith. But in all this machinery of conversion and re-conversion, it does not appear, that it was ever hinted to him, that *religion had any thing to do with the state of his heart*. It was always a source of mortification to him, that his reasoning powers

were captivated by the sophistry of the Romanists ; and he revenged the victory of a false religion over his mind, by becoming an infidel.

In order to form a just estimate of his reputation, we must consider some circumstances of the time at which he appeared. It was about the middle of the last century that Dr. Conyers Middleton, a man of extensive learning, and master of a fine style, published his "Free Inquiry" respecting the miracles of the early church, posterior however to the apostolic age. His theory is, that miraculous powers ceased with the Apostles. He supposes, that we can find an interval of about fifty years, when there is no mention made of the existence of, or claims to any such powers, during which some of the purest and best Fathers wrote, such as Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp. After this short interval of purity and truth, he imagines the lying spirit revived with Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tertullian, and was handed down with fatal authority until it became swollen into the bloated heresy of Popery itself. It will be seen that this hypothesis seems to involve in the charge of delusion all the most venerated writers of the Church, previous to the Reformation. Chrysostom must be thrown into the same limbo of vanity with Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Augustin must lie with the first Gregory of Rome ; for they both of them record miracles which it is impossible for a Protestant to believe.\* Dr. Middleton's book, which in this country would have been received with very general approbation, threw the whole English Church, which has retained a deeper reverence for antiquity than other Protestant denominations, into a flame. Not long after, Gibbon, who had read Middleton with great attention, published his history, and treated all those ancient miracles with that haughty, genteel sneer, for which he was so remarkable. The Church of England, which had prided herself on her liberality and learning, found that she was ranked in point of credulity with Papists and Pagans themselves. It was very exasperating. She arose against it, and attacked the historian ; and hence Gibbon has received a character for

\* See the viii chapter, of the XXII Book, of the City of God. In this chapter Augustin appears, like a robust man dwelling in a sickly climate, strong in his natural vigour, but sickly from the influence of that credulous age. One of the most pleasing of his miracles, is that of a virgin of Hippo, who was cured by anointing herself with oil, into which a presbyter had distilled his tears, *cut pro illa orans Presbyter instillaverat lacrymas suas.*

misrepresentation which he does not deserve. Much that he sneers at, is unquestionably false; though whether any error connected with sincere religion deserves a sneer, may well be doubted. Gibbon has been charged with faults he never committed, and hence his real errors are in danger of passing without reproof.

He certainly was a careful and most laborious investigator. He went up to original records, though he always found them first through the manuduction of some modern guide. I cannot pretend to be acquainted with but a very small portion of those dusty authors, whom he has arranged, with such surpassing erudition, at the bottom of his page. In a few cases I have traced him to his authorities; and it seems to me, he is too honest a man ever to falsify his record; he never relates an event without a witness. Often too, with great acuteness, he disentangles the web, which crossing testimonies had woven before him. His style, though not so dark, we think, as has been sometimes represented, is perhaps too smart and epigrammatical. Still it has the advantage of detaining the attention. Nor should we object altogether to his irony, or to his freedom in laying open the deformities of the Mother Church.

The great error of Gibbon is, he weaves one uniform texture of narration, without informing the reader of the very different gradations in which the events stand in point of probability. He is like an architect, who should build a bridge equally smooth on the surface, but in some places supported by granite arches, and in others by rotten piers. Thus he slips over the story of Mohammed, (relating to events which happened in the heart of the Arabian desert,) with the same confident tone, as he does the deeds of Augustus. In short, this skeptick is a dogmatist; and no writer ever blended facts and opinions together, with such fatal skill. He never can let the event go without a comment; he never can suffer a witness to speak for himself. Whoever is on the stand, or whatever is the cause, the court is always interposing. In short, his is the most coloured page that was ever written; and coloured, not like Lord Clarendon's, who steps boldly forth, brush in hand, and gives a visible stroke, but coloured secretly, in the choice of words, in adjectives and adverbs, in associated ideas, in manner which is scarcely noticed until it is experienced in the powerful effect. Gibbon has a propensity to tread a middle line

between irony and concession; just as Swedenbourg steers between a metaphor and a literal meaning.\*

However, his day is over; all the harm he can ever do is probably done. It is the pride of this age, that the crossing streams of literature have purified the ocean. Not even the genius of Gibbon can cloud the truths of time; and though his history will be read for its facts, and its weighty maxims, it will be read with such allowance and exceptions by every discerning reader, as will preserve him from being blinded to the illustrations which the truths of Christianity have received from time.

It is remarkable that the object for which this work was written, should be so little promoted by it. As the pyramids which were built by the kings of Egypt, to preserve their names, are still preserved, though the names of their builders are lost; so this history, written to promote infidelity, will fail of its object, and last forever.

The history proceeds in an inoffensive tenour, until we come to the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, in which the author gives an account of the rise of Christianity. I have already remarked, that he often presents a series of facts, as all standing on equal credit, without giving notice of the different degrees of probability by which they are supported. He sometimes seems to approach that vulgar delusion of supposing that an event, or writing, must be entirely received, or entirely rejected, without adverting to the degrees of probability on which a rejected testimony may stand. Thus, he treats with the utmost scorn, the fact alluded to by all the ecclesiastical writers, that Pilate sent to Tiberius an account of the Crucifixion.

"The Apology of Tertullian contains two very ancient, very singular, but at the same time very suspicious instances of imperial clemency; the edicts published by Tiberius and by Marcus Antonius, and designed not only to protect the innocence of the Christians, but even to proclaim those stupendous miracles which had attested the truth of their doctrine. The first of these examples is attended with some difficulties, which might perplex the skeptical mind. We are required to believe, *that* Pontius Pilate informed the emperor of the unjust sentence of death which he had pronounced against an innocent, and, as it appeared, a divine person; and that, without acquiring the merit, he exposed himself to the danger of martyrdom; *that* Tiberius, who avowed his

contempt for all religion, immediately conceived the design of placing the Jewish Messiah among the gods of Rome ; *that* his servile senate ventured to disobey the commands of of their master ; *that* Tiberius, instead of resenting their refusal, contented himself with protecting the Christians from the severity of the laws, many years before such laws were enacted, or before the church had assumed any distinct name or existence ; and lastly, *that* the memory of this extraordinary transaction was preserved in the most public and authentic records, which escaped the knowledge of the historians of Greece and Rome, and were only visible to the eyes of an African Christian, who composed his Apology one hundred and sixty years after the death of Tiberius."

But not one of these reasons will be found so conclusive as he represents. There was no need that Pilate should represent his own sentence as unjust ; for he sentenced Christ on the charge of striving to be a king,—a point on which Tiberius was peculiarly jealous. In the second place, it is not so absurd as our historian seems to insinuate, that Tiberius, who avowed his contempt for all religion, should conceive the design of placing the Jewish Messiah among the gods of Rome ; for all tyrants, however atheistic themselves, pay some external deference, at least, to the prejudices of their people ; and to adopt a new deity, was exactly according to the accommodating spirit of polytheism ; perhaps it was the best way to degrade Jesus from the exclusive pre-eminence which he might hold in the minds of some of the people. In the third place, it is not very absurd to suppose that his servile senate might venture on such a point to dispute his commands ; for as it is suggested by Reading in his notes on Eusebius, (see Eusebius, lib. ii. chap. 2d, page 47, Cambridge, 1820,) this is one of those indifferent points on which a tyrant allows his subjects a license, in order more effectually to veil his purposes in more important affairs. Bonaparte was accustomed to allow his senate to oppose his will in points which he deemed non-essential, as a decent veil to cover the deformity of oppression ; and we are told by Tacitus, that Tiberius often did the same. The bargain was with the senate, "you shall play with the shadow of authority, only leave me the substance." In the last place, it is not very improbable that so trifling an incident (as the Pagans would conceive it,) should escape the notice of the secular historian, and be preserved by a Christian teacher, who was

more interested in preserving whatever related to Christianity. The objections of Gibbon were first brought forward by *Tanaquill Faber*, and are well answered in a note to the English edition of Eusebius. I do not believe myself, on the whole, that Pilate wrote any such account; but still I should reject it, conscious that there are a great many probabilities on the other side.\* So he rejects without doubt, and without adverting to any opposite evidence, the famous passage in Josephus, in which that historian alludes to the miracles, and describes the person of our Saviour. He has no doubt that it is a forgery, although he allows it to be a very skilful one.† The reader will find this question very beautifully discussed in one of Dr. Lardner's volumes; and it would be well worth the time of any one to read it, and to contrast the caution and doubts, the patient examination and careful result of Lardner the Christian, with the rashness and dogmatism of Gibbon the skeptick.‡ Lardner has

\* Some people seem to be hardly aware, that a well-regulated mind moves by degrees over the scale of evidence, and often feels deeply the force of a probability, which is, after all, far from producing a settled conviction. In the mental world there is a twilight, as well as a noon-day; and all kinds of twilight, from the first dawn of a doubtful morning, to that which verges to highest illumination of meridian light. Thus the famous passage in John respecting the three witnesses, is rejected by our modern latitudinarians with scorn and contempt, as if nothing could be said in its favour; as if it were as manifest a forgery, as though it were foisted in by the last Trinitarian who happened to write in a religious dispute. Some have gone so far as to say it ought to be expunged from every subsequent edition of the Bible. But, with submission, I would suggest to these critical butchers, with their cleavers in their hands, that this is to lose all the intermediate ground between absolute proof and absolute disproof. A temperate judge never proceeds so in a court of justice. It is true the verdict must be absolute—one way or the other; but much evidence is always admitted which falls short of supreme conviction. Let us suppose that the evidence for the disputed part of these verses,—i. e. 1 John v. 7, 8,—to be as eighteen probabilities to two; there are eighteen probabilities or grains of evidence against their genuineness, and only two for it, (and this, perhaps, is a pretty fair statement of the case.) Ought the passage to be rejected from the text? I answer boldly, No. It ought to be retained, with a note stating how the evidence stands; and thus every reader would be taught to regulate his mind according to the nicer gradations of comparative evidence, and saved from a rashness equally uncritical and irreligious.

† In order to show that the passage is spurious, he points us to the objections of Le Fevre, (Havercamp. Joseph. tom. ii. p. 267—273,) the laboured answer of Daubuz, (p. 187—232,) and the masterly reply (Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne, tom. vii. 237—288) of an anonymous critic, whom he supposes to be the Abbé de Longuerue. However masterly the reply may be, it seems not to have satisfied all the learned judges of a more recent day. Bretschneider, an able German theologian, maintains the genuineness of the passage. See a translation of his *Capita Theologiae Judæorum dogmaticæ e Flavii Josephi scriptis collecta*, auctore C. F. Bretschneider, Leipsic, 1812, in the *Christian Spectator*, vol. VII. for March, 1825.

‡ I allude to it from memory, and cannot therefore point to the volume. I call Lardner a Christian, because he was so compared with Gibbon. No man

a mind like a very delicate pair of scales, which, under the influence of almost equal weights, can incline one way without totally subsiding. But no sooner does the intellectual scale in Gibbon begin to incline, than one side strikes the ground, and the other kicks the beam. It illustrates what I have before remarked, that the skeptick is sometimes very dogmatical.

He often disguises the truth, when the sun-light of events forces him to see it, under the vocabulary of his own school. Whatever may be said of Christianity, it cannot be denied that it wrought a great reformation in the manners of men. This is evident from the testimony of its enemies. When Pliny, for the first time, had Christians before his tribunal, and subjected some of them to the torture, in order to find out what crimes they had committed, he tells us that they affirmed, this was the sum of their crime or mistake, that they were accustomed, on a stated day, to assemble, to sing a hymn to Christ as God (*carmenque Christo, quasi Deo*), and then to bind themselves, by a solemn obligation, not to commit any wickedness, and then to separate, after an innocent repast. We have likewise in a later age the testimonies of Lucian and Julian, (one of them a laughter at all religion, and the other a hater of Christianity,) to the innocence and simplicity of the first Christians. Now, mark how Gibbon manages this fact! He relates it; but clothes it in such language, that the simple reader is hardly conscious of what he is reading.

"It is a very ancient reproach, suggested by the ignorance or the malice of infidelity, that the Christians allured into their party the most atrocious criminals, who, as soon as they were touched by a sense of remorse, were easily persuaded to wash away, in the water of baptism, the guilt of their past conduct, for which the temples of the gods refused to grant them any expiation. But this reproach, when it is cleared from misrepresentation, contributes as much to the honour as it did to the increase of the church. The friends of Christianity may acknowledge without a blush, that many of the most eminent saints had been before their baptism, the most abandoned sinners. Those persons, who in the world had followed, though in an imperfect man-

knew better how to hold the balance of historical probability with a critical eye and an untrembling hand. The discussion on this passage is a beautiful specimen of the coolest impartiality.

ner, the dictates of benevolence and propriety, derived such a calm satisfaction from the opinion of their own rectitude, as rendered them much less susceptible of the sudden emotions of shame, of grief, and of terrour, which have given birth to so many wonderful conversions. After the example of their Divine Master, the missionaries of the Gospel disdained not the society of men, and especially of women, oppressed by the consciousness, and very often by the effects, of their vices. As they emerged from sin and superstition to the glorious hope of immortality, they resolved to devote themselves to a life, not only of virtue but of penitence. The desire of perfection became the ruling passion of their soul; and it is well known, that while reason embraces a cold mediocrity, our passions hurry us, with rapid violence, over the space which lies between the most opposite extremes." [Vol. I. p. 267, Harpers' edit.]

I suppose the love of God *is* a passion; and I suppose that self-righteousness, under the form of a very partial but decent morality, *is* the greatest obstacle that the humbling spirit of the Gospel can meet with in its claims to enter the heart.

In some cases his insinuations vanish before the inductive method of reasoning. Thus he throws out, under the guise of stating the views of the Gnostics, some singular objections to the belief of Christians. The religion of Moses was to give place to a new economy.

"These Judaising Christians seem to have argued with some degree of plausibility from the divine origin of the Mosaic law, and from the immutable perfections of its great Author. They affirmed, *that* if the Being, who is the same through all eternity, had designed to abolish those sacred rites which had served to distinguish his chosen people, the repeal of them would have been no less clear and solemn than their first promulgation; *that*, instead of those frequent declarations, which either suppose or assert the perpetuity of the Mosaic religion, it would have been represented as a provisional scheme intended to last only till the coming of the Messiah, who should instruct mankind in a more perfect mode of faith and of worship; *that* the Messiah himself, and his disciples who conversed with him on earth, instead of authorizing by their example, the most minute observances of the Mosaic law, would have published to the world the abolition of those useless and obsolete

ceremonies, without suffering Christianity to remain during so many years obscurely confounded among the sects of the Jewish church. Arguments like these appear to have been used in the defence of the expiring cause of the Mosaic law; but the industry of our learned divines has abundantly explained the ambiguous language of the Old Testament, and the ambiguous conduct of the apostolic teachers. It was proper gradually to unfold the system of the Gospel, and to pronounce, with the utmost caution and tenderness, a sentence of condemnation so repugnant to the inclination and prejudices of the believing Jews."

It would seem as if these wise Gnostics, and the reporter of their sentiments, had forgotten that there were such passages in the Old Testament, as the following: From the prophet Jeremiah, chapter xxxi, verses 31, 32, 33, 34, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day *that* I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord: But this *shall be* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Again: Daniel, chap. ix, verses 24, 25, 26, 27: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know therefore and understand, *that* from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah, the Prince, *shall be* seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end

thereof *shall be* with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations, he shall make *it* desolate, even unto the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." See also Isaiah, chapter lxvi.

But the passage to which I shall particularly turn the attention of the reader, is the close of chapter xv, vol. I. page 288. It is respecting the omission of Seneca and Pliny the elder, to notice the darkness at the Crucifixion of Christ. "But how shall we excuse the supine inattention of the Pagan and philosophic world, to those evidences which were presented by the hand of Omnipotence, not to their reason, but to their senses? During the age of Christ, of his apostles, and of their first disciples, the doctrine which they preached was confirmed by innumerable prodigies. The lame walked, the blind saw, the sick were healed, the dead were raised, demons were expelled, and the laws of nature were frequently suspended for the benefit of the church. But the sages of Greece and Rome turned aside from the awful spectacle, and pursuing the ordinary occupations of life and study, appeared unconscious of any alteration in the moral or physical government of the world. Under the reign of Tiberius, the whole earth, or at least a celebrated province of the Roman empire, was involved in a preternatural darkness of three hours. Even this miraculous event, which ought to have excited the wonder, the curiosity, and the devotion of mankind, passed without notice, in the age of science and history. It happened during the lifetime of Seneca and the elder Pliny, who must have experienced the immediate effects, or received the earliest intelligence of the prodigy. Each of these philosophers, in a laborious work, has recorded all the great phenomena of nature, earthquakes, meteors, comets, and eclipses, which his indefatigable curiosity could collect. Both the one and the other have omitted to mention the greatest phenomenon to which the mortal eye has been witness since the creation of the globe. A distinct chapter of Pliny is designed for eclipses of an extraordinary nature and unusual duration; but he contents himself with describing the singular defect of light which

followed the murder of Cesar, when, during the greatest part of the year, the orb of the sun appeared pale, and without splendour. The season of obscurity, which cannot surely be compared with the preternatural darkness of the Passion, has been already celebrated by most of the poets, and historians of that memorable age."

This passage will give me an opportunity to notice a very inconsistent demand, which is often made by unbelievers, relating to the proof of the miracles, supporting the religion of Christ. The demand seems to be this; that philosophic heathen should bear their testimony to these miracles, while they continued to despise and disbelieve them. Now is it not evident, from the nature of the case, that this was impossible? A man, in those days, must have been on one side or the other; he must have been in heart either a Christian or a Pagan. Let us suppose that the story of the supernatural darkness at the Crucifixion, had travelled to Rome, and reached the ears of Seneca and Pliny. They must have heard it, not as a natural phenomenon, but a supernatural work, wrought to establish a new religion. Let us suppose they both heard and believed it. What is the consequence? Seneca and Pliny are no longer what they were; that is, they are not Pagan writers, but they fall into the rank of Christians; and their testimony would be no more, in Gibbon's view, than that of Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John, or Paul, or a thousand other believers, who, by embracing Christianity, have left their implicit testimony to the truth of this miracle. The moment they become witnesses to the truth of the fact, they lose, in that very act, the qualification demanded of them: as the anatomist, who opens the animal to see how life operates, destroys life in the very process. Infidels call for the testimony of enemies; and we tell them, we have thousands of such testimonies, only with this qualification, that the moment they were competent witnesses, they ceased to be enemies. The testimony of every Christian in the first ages, is the testimony of a quondam enemy, overcome by the power of truth, and this is necessary from the very nature of the case; for certainly, we should not believe the testimony of a witness to a fact, which produced no conviction on his own mind. You demand the testimony of such men as Pliny and Seneca to the truth of Gospel miracles; forgetting that, had they believed them,

they could have no longer sustained their character as unbelievers, but must have become the despised disciples of the new religion.

But suppose both these writers, on hearing of this supernatural darkness, disbelieved it,—as was most probably the case, for certainly the very idea of a heathen philosopher, supposes a rejection of the miracles of the Gospel. What is more natural than for them to pass it by with silent contempt? No intelligent Christian supposes the darkness extended farther than the land of Judea: and some confine it to the district of Jerusalem. But let it be as extensive as the most enlarged construction of the words can require, the Roman naturalists must have heard of it, in connexion with the fact, and with the purpose for which it was wrought. Now what temptation had they to notice such a story, in works written expressly on the operations of nature. Had they believed the story, they would no longer have been the Plinys and Senecas required; and if they did not believe it, they must of course have regarded it as a superstitious tale, which they were not obliged to confute, in a work written with a very different design. If the object of Gibbon, in quoting their silence, was to prove to us that we have not their testimony in favour of the Gospel, it was certainly a very superfluous labour; for this is included in the very idea of their having continued heathens. But then it must be remembered, that in the very idea that thousands and thousands of those who were originally unbelievers, not in Rome, but on the very spot where the miracle was wrought, forsook their old opinions and embraced the Gospel, is included the fact that the enemies of Christianity have borne witness to its truth; though they must of necessity, in that very deed, have ceased to be enemies.

The evidence of omission is in all cases a very weak kind of proof; and becomes more weak in proportion as the omission is natural. In this case, I must confess that the silence of these writers seems to me exactly accordant with their circumstances and characters, even on the supposition that the darkness was known by them.

I should be sorry to copy Gibbon's example, and rake up the ancient scandal against the philosophers, with the same diligence with which he has gathered up every thing which could serve to blacken the character of the ancient Christians. I will only just hint concerning Seneca, that if what

Tacitus, that stern master of morals and truth, says of him, be correct, Seneca was not the man, after all the pompous morality of his writings, whom a Christian would select, as "adorning an age, and exalting human nature." There are a few chance words in Tacitus, which reflect a dark shade on the character of Seneca. When the Emperor Nero attempted to drown his mother at sea, and the news was brought him that she had escaped, he was in the utmost terror and consternation; he feared she would fly to Rome, reveal the deed, appeal to the indignation of the Senate, and arm the soldiers against him. He sent for Seneca and Burrus, to consult what was to be done; and on this occasion Tacitus says of him, in one of those sentences of his which speak volumes, *incretum an et ante gnaros*.\* Is it possible? Was Seneca an accessory to one of the foulest deeds that ever blackened the annals of human nature? But however this may be, her death was decided on in this very consultation, and Seneca implicitly advised it, and justified it when done. What would have been said, what clamours and outcries of horror should we have heard, had half this wickedness been even tolerated by a Christian?

As to Pliny, if he did not believe the miracles recorded in the Gospels, it was certainly not for the want of a sufficient stock of credulity. He believed that there was a race of people in Scythia, somewhere north-east of the Sea of Azof, who had one eye in the middle of their foreheads, and fought with gryphons, a kind of winged beasts, for gold. He believed that the watch-fires made on the shores of Greece at the sixth hour of the day, i. e. 12 o'clock, could be seen in those regions where it was the third hour of the night, that is, one hundred and thirty-five degrees, or more than one third of the circumference of our globe. He believed that a boy on the shores of Italy, kept a tame dolphin, and used to ride out to sea on his back. He believed that earthquakes were omens and prognostics of far greater evils than they themselves produced. He believed that Mount Casius, between Egypt and Palestine, was so high as to catch the beams of the rising sun three hours before daybreak. He believed, like other infidels, every folly he was under no obligation to believe, and rejected those miracles to the belief of which the objection was complete.

He could believe any thing which pleased a sportive fancy, but nothing which tended to confirm the dominion of God.

These two chapters of Gibbon have had more efficacy in insinuating the principles of infidelity into the minds of the reading public, than all the laboured arguments of far more elaborate attacks upon our religion. They lie in the popular road to knowledge; they come to us under the guise of great candour; they are the doubts and surmises of a man, who professes to have no other object than to hold evenly the balance of historical truth. And yet they artfully insinuate whatever might engender doubts, and as artfully exclude all the counterbalancing circumstances by which these doubts might be removed.

There is one fallacy which runs through this history, to which we must allude in closing our remarks on this author. In judging of the influence of Christianity, as exemplified in the lives of its professors, he compares their lives with the abstract standard of Christian perfection, and not with the degrees by which they were made better than they formerly were, or than others around them continued to be. The faults of the Christians, their controversies, their ambition, were great, we confess. But how much better than the manners of the pagans,—their gladiatorial shows, their sensuality, their proscriptions, their wars, their seditions, their torrents of blood! The worst ambition of the most hypocritical bishop that ever abused the name of Christianity, is better than the best virtues of an Anthony who wallowed in drunkenness, and of a Sylla who bathed in blood.\*

\* The reader will perceive that the account which we have given of the supernatural darkness at the Crucifixion, and the answers given to the historian's objections, are different from what is attempted in Bishop Watson's letter to our Author. The Bishop's reply, notwithstanding his beautiful style and the classical elegance of his taste, is very unsatisfactory.—Charity requires us to give him credit for sincerity; but some learned men have sometimes defended a cause, as if they half wished to betray it; at least, as if its importance had never sunk from their heads, to occupy and inspire their hearts.

ART. III. REVIEW OF THE WORKS OF THE REV. DR.  
BELLAMY.

By REV. JOHN WOODBRIDGE, D. D. New-York.

THE REV. DR. Joseph Bellamy was born in New-Cheshire, Conn., in 1719. He was of a worthy and respectable family. He must have commenced study preparatory to a public education, very early in life; since, at the age of sixteen years, he was graduated at Yale College, in his native State. Not long after the completion of his collegiate course, he is supposed to have received those religious impressions, which issued, there is no reason to doubt, in the renewal of his heart to holiness, and his consequent introduction into the spiritual family of God. He was licensed to preach the Gospel when he was about eighteen; was acceptable and useful, wherever he was called to labour in the work of the Lord; and was ordained over the church and congregation in Bethlehem, as their pastor, in the spring of 1740, in the twenty-first or twenty-second year of his age. The hearts of that favoured people were especially attracted towards the youthful herald of the cross, in consequence of a general and earnest attention to religion among them, which had been produced by the divine blessing on his instrumentality.

As a preacher, he was not only bold, pungent, and convincing, but often extremely graphic in his delineations of character and events, so as to present a living and moving picture before the minds of his auditory. His occasional vulgarisms and eccentricities belonged as much to the times, as to the man. He could dissect the human heart with the skill of an anatomist. In the extensive revivals of religion, which occurred during the early part of his ministry, he was eminently active and useful, travelling from place to place, preaching daily, and enjoying the happiness, almost continually, of directing inquirers to the only foundation of hope for sinful men. After that glorious work of grace had been corrupted by enthusiasm, errors and divisions ensued, till religious excitements began to be dreaded as the harbingers of disorder, and every evil work. A deplorable and general spiritual apathy was the consequence; the friends of Zion were grieved, and Satan seemed to triumph. After this melancholy change in the state of the churches, Dr. Bellamy was chiefly employed in his studies at home, in

the duties of his pastoral office, and in the business of a teacher to young men, preparatory for the Christian ministry. He continued to be connected with the church in Bethlehem, to the close of his life, which was terminated on the 6th of March, 1790, in the seventy-second year of his age.\*

\* Previously to that memorable season of "refreshing from the presence of the Lord," which was enjoyed in Great Britain and in this country, near the commencement of the last century, a general religious declension began to be visible, threatening the utter extinction of vital godliness in both hemispheres. The complaints by English writers, both in the establishment and among dissenters, can leave no doubt respecting the state of religion in what was then called the mother country. "I cannot," says Burnet, "look on without the deepest concern, when I see imminent ruin hanging over this church, and by consequence, over the whole reformation. The outward state of things is black enough, God knows; but that which heightens my fears rises chiefly from the inward state into which we are unhappily fallen." Again: "What are we like to grow to? In what a case are we to deal with an adversary, atheist, papist, or dissenter, or in any sort to promote the honour of God, and carry on the great concerns of the Gospel, when so gross an ignorance in the fundamentals of religion has spread itself among those who ought to teach others." The state of the dissenting churches was little better than that of the establishment: as is apparent from the acknowledgments of evangelical dissenters themselves. The Rev. J. Baker, a correspondent of Doddridge, wrote to the latter, in 1744, as follows: "The dissenting interest is not like itself. I hardly know it. It used to be famous for faith, holiness, and love. I knew the time, when I had no doubt, into whatever place of worship I went among dissenters, but that my heart would be warmed and comforted, and my edification promoted. Now I hear prayers and sermons, which I neither relish nor understand. Evangelical truth and duty are quite old-fashioned things: many pulpits are not so much as chaste: one's ears are so dinned with 'reason,' 'the great law of reason,' and 'the eternal law of reason,' that it is enough to put one out of conceit with the chief excellency of our nature, because it is so idolized, and even deified." Again: "If the people departed from the doctrines of the reformation as much as the ministers, I should begin to think whether ours were an interest worth preserving."

The natural consequence of this departure from the faith, and growing stupidity in ministers and churches, was such as was lamented by the learned Bishop Butler, in 1736, in the following terms: "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons, that Christianity is not so much as a subject of enquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly, they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." See "an Introductory Essay" to the Miscellaneous Works of Philip Doddridge, D. D. by the Rev. T. Morell, of Wymondley College.

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the pulse of spiritual life had become extensively feeble and languid in the churches of New-England; the line of distinction between the holy and the profane, seemed ready to be obliterated; the peculiar doctrines of the reformation, which had been the glory of the early Puritans, were becoming less and less the subjects of earnest inculcation from the pulpit and the press. "About this time," says Edwards, in his Narrative of Surprising Conversions, "began the great noise that was in this part of the country, about Arminianism, which seemed to appear with a very threatening aspect upon the interest of religion here."

It was under circumstances like these, that God raised up instruments, in Europe and America, to revive his sinking cause. Among the happy men employed by Providence for this purpose, were Edwards, Bellamy, and others of a kindred spirit, in New-England. "The memory of the just is blessed."

His understanding was uncommonly vigorous; his talent of observation was peculiar; and his piety, if we may form an opinion from his life and writings, presented a rare combination of sound judgment, and the clearest intellectual views, with intense spiritual affections. By his love of knowledge, his intimate acquaintance with some of the ablest theologians in the country, especially with Jonathan Edwards, that "Coryphæus of modern divines," by his theological attainments, his mental discrimination, and his earnest attention to the revivals and religious controversies of the age in which he lived; he was eminently qualified to state with clearness, and defend with ability, the great principles of Christian doctrine, experience and practice.

The influence of his various publications has been great; they have done much to purify the churches of Connecticut from Arminian, Antinomian, and Neonomian errors,—and they have contributed not a little to perspicuity of statement, consistency of views, and force of argument, in some of the most popular evangelical writers in Great Britain, as well as America. They have been strongly recommended, by men of high distinction, at home and abroad. His "True Religion Delineated," published about four years after the treatise of Edward's on the Affections, was introduced to the world with the powerful recommendation of the author of that immortal work. Among those who encouraged the publication of an edition of his works in 1811, as the productions of "one of the most distinguished and useful writers of the last age," we find the names of Rodgers and Miller, of New-York; James P. Wilson, Trumbull, Morse, Azel Backus, Griffen, Woods, Stewart, and Asahel Hooker. Among those in Great Britain who have appreciated his labours with some degree of justice, it is sufficient to mention Erskine, Fuller, and Thomas Scott; men, who, as able defenders of Calvinistic theology, have had few superiours in any country, and who possessed, in no ordinary measure, that spiritual gust, which is perhaps the most essential requisite to a clear, full, and consistent reception of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. The Rev. Dr. Burns, of Paisley, in Scotland, says of Dr. Bellamy, that he "has been long known and esteemed in the church of Christ, as one of the ablest defenders of divine truth."

It is to be regretted, that the works of Dr. Bellamy, and of other clear thinkers like him, are not more extensively

circulated and studied, in this age of Christian action, when there is peculiar danger of resting in a religion, which has its seat rather in the animal spirits, and physical instincts, than in the deep foundations of the understanding and heart.

A full analysis of his various writings, would exceed the limits, suitable to such a work as the Literary and Theological Review. I shall be gratified, if I can say any thing which will induce my readers to pay an increased attention to his luminous discussions, powerful argumentation, and striking though unadorned method of exhibiting the truth.

The first, and perhaps the most important treatise of Dr. Bellamy, was his "True Religion Delineated," written soon after the decline of the great religious excitement in New-England, and published about the year 1750, when he was little more than thirty years of age. It exhibits, throughout, the process of a mind accustomed to self-inspection, philosophical accuracy of thought, a patient study of the Bible, and a profound acquaintance with the subject of experimental religion, in all its branches. He evidently had an ardent zeal for the purity of revivals of religion, viewing them as inseparably connected with the rapid diffusion, and ultimate universal triumph of Christianity; and, with the strong sensibility of an enlightened lover of the cause of human holiness and happiness, he set himself to correct the extravagancies by which they had been vitiated, dishonoured, and to a great extent destroyed.

The fundamental principle which he assumes in this work, is, that "true religion consists in a conformity to the law of God, and in a compliance with the gospel of Christ;" and the correctness of this general view of the subject, must be admitted by every believer in the divine authority of the Scriptures. Dr. Bellamy begins with a discussion of the claims of the law, and the nature and effects of the obedience which it enjoins; thus portraying the essential features of that holiness, which is the same under all dispensations of religion, and in all worlds. He selects for his text, or a main principle whereon all his reasoning is to be built, that summary of the divine law which is contained in Matt. 22: 37—40, and which is as philosophically just and comprehensive, as it is spiritual and searching. His train of thought is as follows:

With respect to the *nature of love to God*, it implies a true knowledge of his attributes and character; a high esteem of him, and exultation in his prerogatives; benevolence, or an earnest desire that *he* may be glorified in us, in all creatures, and in all events; and a delight in his perfections, service, and the welfare of his kingdom.

The *motives* from which true love to God originates, are, the infinite worthiness and amiableness of his nature; and, in connexion with, and in subserviency to this, the relations towards us which he sustains, as our proprietor, law-giver, and supreme benefactor.

The *measure* of love to God which is required, is, the utmost extent of our natural capacity, without any allowance for our disinclination, or the strength of our aversion to this duty. Such love will infallibly lead to all those overt acts of obedience, which God has required of his creatures.

The *love to our neighbour*, which is enjoined, includes a due estimation of those qualities which render him worthy of our regard; a benevolent respect for his happiness; and a complacency in his moral worth.

The *motives* to this love, are, its intrinsic fitness; the command of God; and the divine example.

Its *standard*, is that degree of love which it is proper that we should exercise towards ourselves.

From these principles, Dr. Bellamy justly infers, that holy love to mankind differs essentially from those instincts which are commonly called natural compassion, good nature, and natural affection; and also, from party spirit, that love to others which is a mere reciprocity of love, and that love which one bad man feels to other bad men, because they are like himself.

Such is the religion required in the law; and, as it regards its nature and effects, it is the only true religion in the universe. By such a process, Dr. Bellamy is led to some most important deductions, respecting a number of the controverted and peculiarly humbling doctrines of the Gospel; and a due attention to his reasoning here, would do much to confirm the wavering in the sound scriptural views which were maintained by the fathers of the American church.

His second discourse, in which he shows, in what a *genuine compliance with the gospel consists*, is founded on John 3: 16; "For God so loved the world, that he gave

his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

In treating this part of his general subject, agreeably to the spirit of the text, Dr. Bellamy considers,

I. The *grounds* on which the Most High regarded mankind as being in a perishing condition; which are, their relation to Adam as their public head; their destitution of the divine moral image; their entire positive sinfulness; their aversion to reconciliation; the fixed bent of their hearts, when unrestrained, to the most aggravated degrees of wickedness; their insensibility to their actual vileness and ill-desert; and God's sovereign right to extend mercy to them or not, as should seem good in his sight:

II. His *motive* to do what he has done for their recovery; which was, not any injustice in the original constitution with Adam; not an excessive rigour in the law of nature, under which all mankind are born; not any diminution of their ill-desert on account of their utter moral impotency; not any expectation, on his part, that, ruined as they are, they would ever, of their own accord, heartily thank him for his wonderful mercy; but wholly his own infinite benevolence, and rich, free, sovereign grace:

III. The *necessity* of a *Mediator*, and how the way to life has been opened by him, whom God has provided:

IV. The *nature* of saving *faith* in the *Mediator*; and,

V. The *promise* of everlasting life to those that believe.

These several topics Dr. Bellamy treats in a very able manner. The whole discussion, indeed, is at once thorough, simple, and highly practical. Any man, who will read the whole treatise with candour, and with a disposition to apply its searching tests of piety in examining his own heart, can hardly fail to judge correctly of his character and state, in the sight of God. It exposes formality, self-righteousness, pharisaical zeal, and antinomian selfishness, with such plainness and power, as to destroy every hope of salvation which does not spring from spiritual renovation, and is not built on the Rock of Ages.

The entire tissue of the work, as well as of most of the other writings of Dr. Bellamy, presupposes the truth, in its main features, of the system which is usually called Calvinistic, in distinction from Arminian, Pelagian, and semi-

Pelagian views of the divine government and human nature.

Thus he maintains, that the glory of God is his highest end in the creation and government of all things; and that in reference to this end, he has specifically ordained evil, as well as good. Observe his words:

"When he first designed to create the world, as it was easy for him to have determined, that neither angels nor men should ever sin, and that misery should never have been heard of in all his dominions, so he could easily have prevented both sin and misery. Why did he not? Surely, not for want of goodness in his nature; but because, in his infinite wisdom, he did not think it best on the whole. It was not because he had not sufficient power to preserve angels and men all holy and happy; for it is certain he had: it was not because preventing grace would have been *inconsistent with their being free agents*; for it *would not*;" (let the reader mark this;) "it was not because he did not thoroughly consider and weigh the thing with all its consequences; for it is certain he did. But, upon the whole, all things considered, he judged it best to permit the angels to sin, and men to fall; and so let misery into his dominions. There is no doubt but that, all things considered, he thought it best to permit things to come to pass just as they did; and if he thought it best, it was best; for his understanding is infinite. But why was it best? What was his *grand end* in creating and governing the world? Why, look; what end is he at last like to obtain, and what will be the final result? Why, in all, he will exert and display every one of his perfections to the life, and so, by all, will exhibit a most perfect and exact image of himself. This is the greatest and best thing he can aim at in all his works; and this, therefore ought to be his *last end*. Now, it is evident, that the fall of the angels and of man, together with all those things which have and will come to pass in consequence thereof, will serve to give a much more lively representation of God, than could possibly have been exhibited, had there never been any sin or misery."—P. 89, 90.

"God has, in fact, permitted sin to enter into the world; does, in fact, permit many to die in their sins; will, in fact, punish them forever; and *all* consistent with the infinite goodness of his nature. And since it is consistent with his

goodness *to do as he does*, it was consistent with his goodness to determine with himself beforehand *to do so*. What God, *from eternity*, decreed to do, that God, *in time*, will do; therefore, if *all* God's *conduct* be holy, just and good, so also are *all* his *decrees*; unless we suppose it to be wrong for the infinitely wise God, from all eternity, to determine upon a conduct in all respects right; than which nothing can be more absurd."—P. 91.

All the author's works accord with the views expressed in these extracts, of the motive, extent, and particularity of the divine decrees.

His statement of the much vilified and hated doctrine of election, is such as every consistent Calvinist must approve. I give the following quotations:

"God is, through Christ, ready to be reconciled to all who will repent. He sends the news of pardon and peace around a guilty world, and invites every one to come. But inasmuch as mankind will not hearken, but are obstinately set in their way, therefore he takes state upon himself, and says, *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy*. Some he may suffer to take their own way, if he pleases; and others he may subdue and recover to himself, by his own all conquering grace. And to a certain number, from eternity he intended to show this special mercy; and these are said to be *given to Christ*. And with a special eye to these *sheep*, did he *lay down his life*; his Father intending, and he intending, that they, in spite of all opposition, should be brought to eternal life at last; and hence the *elect* do always *obtain*. With a view to these, it was promised in the covenant of redemption, that Christ should *see of the travail of his soul*."—P. 390 and 391.

"He has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and compassion on whom he will have compassion; and many times takes the meanest and vilest, that the sovereignty of his grace might be the more illustrious, and the pride of all flesh be brought low, and the Lord alone be exalted. And surely such a conduct infinitely becomes the Supreme Governour of the whole world."—P. 239. See also p. 240.

With nearly all Calvinistic writers, Dr. Bellamy maintains, (in opposition to Arminians and Pelagians, who, in direct contradiction of the divine testimony, declare *created holiness* to be impossible,) that Adam was *created* with a holy nature, or disposition to obedience; and also, that we

have become sinners, in consequence of our relation to him, as our federal head.

"Adam was created in the image of God. It was con-natural to him to love God with all his heart; and this would have been our case, had he not rebelled against God; but now we are born devoid of the divine image, have no heart for God, are transgressors from the womb; *by nature, children of wrath.*"—P. 221. The doctrine of our relation to Adam as our public head, is also clearly taught in pages 300 and 301, and in various other places.

Besides the words just quoted, Dr. Bellamy teaches the doctrine of *native depravity*, or *birth-sin*, in many passages of a most unequivocal import.

"We are in fact *born* like the wild asses' colt, as senseless of God, and as void and destitute of grace. We have nature, but no grace. And so we have a heart to love ourselves, but no heart to love God; and may be moved to zeal by selfish views, but cannot be influenced by the infinite moral beauty of the divine nature."—P. 200.

"We may learn that we were *born into the world*, not only destitute of a conformity to the law, but that we are naturally diametrically opposed to it in the temper of our hearts."—P. 201.

"It is plainly the very *native* bent of their hearts, to love themselves above all."—P. 202.

"Our *native* disposition to love ourselves supremely, live to ourselves ultimately, &c. is directly contrary to God's holy law."—P. 211.

It is maintained in the Quarterly Christian Spectator,\* that Dr. Bellamy's views of native depravity, are the same with those, which, within the last few years, have been vindicated in that publication. The question may seem to be of little consequence in itself; and yet, the authority of such a name as his, (and this the Reviewer appears well to understand,) cannot fail to have its influence with the admirers of New-England theology. Do not the passages already cited manifestly teach that mankind are sinful from *their birth*? Could words have made Dr. Bellamy's meaning plainer? And is it to be supposed, that, in these repeated instances, this fearless and perspicuous writer has used language without meaning, or with a *jesuitical mental reservation*? He

\* September No. for 1830; p. 407, 408, 409.

was an honest man, if ever man deserved that name. To what purpose, then, is the affirmation of the Reviewer, that "Dr. Bellamy does not, and how could he, decide precisely *when* sinful exercises commence?" Be it so; yet he does decide that our moral depravity is as early, at least, as our birth; a *doctrine* manifestly contrary to that of those who leave this point unsettled, or who say it is of no importance, and attempt to vindicate the propriety of infant baptism, and prayers for the regeneration of infants, on the principle, that if they live long enough, they *will commit sin*. Is this Dr. Bellamy's view of the matter? As far from it, as the east is from the west. And on what is the opinion predicated, that he is doubtful whether infants, *at their birth*, have any moral character? On a passage in which he affirms that sin is voluntary, or implies voluntariness, and denies that it belongs to the essence of our souls, like the essential attributes of our physical and moral nature. The Reviewer, by shifting the question, turns the attention of his readers from the main point at issue, which is our native moral corruption, by virtue of our connexion with Adam. But let us hear Dr. Bellamy:

"These are the earliest dispositions,"—meaning, as the foregoing sentences prove, loving ourselves supremely, delighting in that which is not God, &c.,—"that are discovered in our nature; and although I do not think that they are concreated by God together with the essence of our souls, yet they seem to be the very first propensities of the new-made soul. So that they are, in a sense, *connatural*, our whole hearts are perfectly and entirely bent this way, from their very first motion. These propensities, perhaps, in some sense, may be said to be *contracted*, in opposition to their being strictly and philosophically *natural*, because they are not created by God with the essence of the soul, but result from its native choice, or rather, more strictly, are themselves its native choice." Here Dr. Bellamy affirms, that strictly, moral depravity is not the *effect* of a wrong choice, as the advocates of the self-determining power of the will suppose, but that it is the wrong choice itself, and that this is *native*. But what is the meaning of the word *native*? The following are the principal definitions of the term, in its adjective form; *produced by nature, not artificial, natural, such as is according to nature, not affected*,

*conferred by birth, pertaining to the time or place of birth, original.*

To return to Dr. Bellamy. "But most certainly these propensities are not *contracted* in the sense that many vicious habits are, merely by long use and custom. In opposition to *such* vicious habits, they may be called *connatural*. Little children do very early bad things, and contract bad dispositions; but these propensities are evidently antecedent to every bad thing infused or instilled by evil examples, or gotten by practice, or occasioned by temptation." The beginning of depravity in children, then, according to Dr. Bellamy, is not "occasioned by temptation," operating upon their "innocent constitutional susceptibilities," but has its seat in their souls themselves, anterior to the agency of temptation upon them. By "choice," then, it seems but justice to admit, he must have intended, in common with President Edwards, the state or exercise of the moral affections, as well as specific acts of the will, considered as distinct from these affections. "And hence," he goes on to tell us, "it is become customary to call them *natural*, and to say that it is our *very nature* to be so inclined; and to say that these propensities are *natural*, would to common people be the most apt way of expressing the thing." Would it be "*the most apt way*," provided it were doubtful whether children began to be sinful, till some time after their birth? "But it ought to be remembered, that they are not *natural* in the same sense as the *faculties* of our souls are; for they are not the workmanship of God, but our native choice, and the voluntary, free, spontaneous bent of our hearts. And to keep up this distinction, I frequently choose the word *native*, instead of *natural*." pp. 201, 202.

This is the passage, from which the Reviewer is led to say, "we see not how any language could express the fact more fully and clearly, that sin commences and wholly consists in voluntary exercises and acts;" and, "Dr. Bellamy does not, and how could he, decide precisely *when* sinful exercises commence, though according to him, it cannot be till after the soul is formed;" and "there is a *space*, then, in the *order of nature*, between the creation of the soul and the commencement of depravity." What does all this mean? Independently of the views which Dr. Bellamy elsewhere expresses, (and we ought not, without good evidence, to believe that he directly contradicts himself,) this

passage itself, and its connexion, are directly opposed to the notion, that men are born without any moral character. He was too sagacious, to suppose, that universal depravity originates without any cause, or that it is simply the consequence of that moral agency, which was no less the property of Adam before the fall, than it is now of his posterity, and belongs alike to all accountable beings, whether holy or sinful, in all worlds.

In the paragraph immediately preceding this passage, Dr. Bellamy says, "We are born into the world not only destitute of a conformity to the law, but *are naturally diametrically opposed to it in the temper of our hearts*. The law requires us to *love God supremely*, but the native bent of our hearts is to *love ourselves supremely*. The law requires us to *love our neighbour as ourselves*, but the native bent of our hearts is to *be inordinately selfish*." Supreme self-love, or which is the same thing, seeking supremely our own happiness, is here declared to be the essence of sin, or the temper of heart which is diametrically opposite to the requisitions of the law. Some may affirm, that such self-love is not sinful, that it is an "innocent susceptibility," a part of our "constitution," and even the spring of virtue; but these individuals must, of course, agree with Dr. Bellamy in the opinion, that it is a *native* propensity; and, as he differs from them, in that he believed it was *criminal*, I do not see how they can help admitting, that he regarded moral depravity as an attribute of human beings, even *from their birth*. We have always considered it as a sound rule of interpretation, (and the present example confirms us in the justness of our opinion,) to endeavour to ascertain the scope of an author's discourse, before we decide peremptorily on the meaning of an insulated sentence.

Unfortunately for the Reviewer, the words immediately following the passage on which he lays such stress, are quite as decisive of Dr. Bellamy's meaning as those just quoted—"And now that these dispositions are, as it were, *thus born with us*, is as evident from experience, as any thing of this kind can be; for these are the earliest dispositions that man's nature discovers, and are evidently discovered before little children are capable of learning them from others.\* Yea,

\* "How much earlier they exist, than they are disclosed to observers," remarks the Reviewer, "he (Dr. Bellamy) does not say." True, but he does

it is plainly the very native bent of their hearts, to love themselves above all ; to make their ease, comfort, and happiness, their last end, and their all ; and to seek for all from the *creature*, or, in other words, from that which is not God."

The Reviewer imagines, that he sees in page 219, the elements of that system, which attributes our sinfulness to the operation of our innocent appetites and susceptibilities, excited, in the absence of positive moral rectitude, by a world whose influence must be ensnaring ; and he intimates, that he and Dr. Bellamy, with whom he couples Edwards, have adopted the *same* philosophy in accounting for the moral depravity of mankind. But what does Dr. Bellamy actually say?

"God only creates the naked essence of our souls, our natural faculties, and power to think, and will, and to love and hate ; and this *evil bent* of our hearts is *not of his making*, but is the *spontaneous propensity* of our own *wills* ; for we, being born devoid of the divine image, ignorant of God, and insensible of his glory, do, *of our own accord*, turn to ourselves, and the things of time and sense, and to any thing that suits a graceless heart, and there all our affections centre ; from whence we natively become averse to God, and to all that which is spiritually good, and inclined to all sin. So that the *positive* corruption of our nature is not any thing created by God, but arises *merely* from a *privative* cause."

This, the reader will be pleased to observe, is introduced by Dr. Bellamy, as an answer to the objection, that, "If we are natively sinful, God made us so, and by consequence is the *author of sin*." It is to be noted also, that his very language imports, what many would account an unwarrantable supposition, that God might have made us holy from our birth ; and therefore, we become sinners in consequence of our being left to ourselves. The same doctrine he elsewhere more explicitly teaches.\* Indeed, the phrase,

say, that they are *born with us*, that is, exist as early as our birth. The *quasi* form of the expression in the above quoted sentence, it is manifest, from comparing it with other passages already adduced, was not intended to intimate any doubt in the writer's mind, as to the time of the actual commencement of moral depravity, in the descendants of Adam. What right then, has the Reviewer to say as he does, that Dr. Bellamy means "merely that *these dispositions* exist as early as their subjects are capable of exhibiting any visible tokens of them?"

\* See, for example, p. 221.

"a *privative cause*," supposes the possibility of such a *positive* act on the part of God, as might have hindered men from sinning, without any infringement of the laws of the nature he had given them; and this accords with various passages, already quoted from the writings of Dr. Bellamy. His view of the subject differed, therefore, in a material point, from that of those who affirm moral depravity to be the *certain* consequence, aside from any divine act in withdrawing gracious influences, of our physical constitution, our external circumstances, and the free exercise of our powers of moral agency. The same thing is manifest, from his resolution, in the paragraph immediately succeeding that just quoted, of the present arrangement, not into any stubborn necessity in the nature of our faculties as influenced by the world around us, but entirely into the sovereign will of God. Would the Christian Spectator have reasoned in the same manner? In answering the objection, "That it is not consistent with the divine perfections to bring mankind into the world under such sad and unhappy circumstances,"—Dr. Bellamy refers to the words of the apostle, "Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" All his reasoning, in reply to this objection, proceeds upon the assumption of God's sovereignty in that constitution, which connects the universal sinfulness of our race, with the disobedience of Adam. He affirms that, in consequence of our being "born devoid of the divine image, ignorant of God, insensible of his infinite glory, we are naturally disposed to love ourselves supremely," &c.; "that this temper is direct contrariety to God's holy law, is exceedingly sinful, and is the seat of all wickedness. Now," he adds, "to say it is not consistent with the divine perfections that mankind should be brought into the world, as *in fact* they are, is wickedly to fly in the face of our almighty Creator, and expressly charge him with unrighteousness. If we cannot see into this dispensation of divine providence, yet we ought to remember that God *is holy in all his ways, and righteous in all his works, and that the judge of all the earth will do right.*"\* But who would think of adopting this

\* On the subject of native depravity, Dr. Bellamy's opinion seems to have coincided very nearly with that of Turretin, who says, *Insut. Theol. tom. i. sec. 9, Q. 12, § 8, 9, "Licet anima sine ulla labe creetur a Deo, non creatur tamen cum justitia originali, qualis anima Adami ad imaginem Dei; sed cum ejus carentia in pœnam primi peccati. Ut hic distinguendum sit inter animam*

method of vindicating the Pelagian notion of the character and state of infants?

In regard to the *extent* of moral depravity in unregenerate men, Dr. Bellamy maintains, that it is total, implying utter enmity against God, and all true goodness. Thus he says, p. 222, that "their very best religious performances are sinful;" and p. 223, that "they are done in a manner directly contrary to the law of God;" that "there is not the least hope in the sinner's case, but what arises from the sovereign mercy of God;" that there are no "promises" made to unrenewed men; that they are "dead in sin, cannot be subject to the law, cannot please God;" and p. 225, that "a sinner cares not a jot for God, and if he had ever so many motives, he would only serve himself, but not serve God at all;" and p. 226, that the "great earnestness of awakened sinners makes them feel and find that they are enemies to God, and dead in sin; and hereby a foundation is laid for them to see the justice of God in their damnation, and so the reasonableness of God's having mercy on whom he will have mercy."

As it regards the nature of the sinner's *inability*, Dr. Bellamy resolves it entirely into a wrong state of heart, affections, or will. In this he agrees, not only with Edwards, Hopkins, Smalley, and the New-England divines generally, of the last half century, but with Augustine, that great champion of the doctrines of grace, and a multitude of European theologians of later times. Indeed, after all the controversies which have been had upon the question, nearly all parties at this day will agree, that the inability of the sinner is a crime for which he deserves punishment, and not a mere calamity, like idiocy or madness, paralyzing the force of all commands, and releasing its subjects, so far as it extends,

puram, impuram, et non puram. Illa pura dicitur, quæ ornata est habitu sanctitatis; impura, quæ contrarium habitum injustitiæ habet; non pura, quæ licet nullum habeat habitum bonum, nullum tamen habet malum, sed creatur simpliciter cum facultatibus naturalibus; qualis supponitur creari a Deo post lapsum, quia imago Dei amissa semel per peccatum, non potest amplius restitui nisi regenerationis beneficio per Spiritum Sanctum. Quamvis autem animæ creentur a Deo destitutæ justitiæ originali; non propterea Deus potest censeri auctor peccati, quia aliud est impuritatem infundere, aliud puritatem non dare, qua homo se indignum reddidit in Adamo." While Turretin affirms, that our sin is to be attributed to a *privative cause*, he most unequivocally teaches that, had God pleased, he might have *created* us with a *holy nature*, so that our "natural faculties," instead of leading us into sin, would have been implicitly regulated by the principles of obedience. It is also his doctrine, that the want of original righteousness implies, in itself, our utter ruin, and that it cannot be restored without regeneration. Our character, at the very beginning of our existence, therefore, is, according to him, entirely different from what it would have been, had Adam never sinned.

from all blame. The Bible most manifestly attributes men's want of ability to obey, to the strength of their disinclination, or, the dominion of their wicked prejudices and passions. Hence, while it affirms most explicitly, that *no man can come to Christ, except he be drawn by the Father*; that the natural or unrenewed man cannot know the things of the Spirit; and that a new heart, repentance and faith, are his gifts; it, at the same time, in the most solemn manner, charges the ruin of sinners upon their inexcusable aversion to holiness, and their unwillingness to be saved on the terms proposed in the Gospel. That Dr. Bellamy held to a *real*, though criminal *inability*, on the part of sinners, is unquestionable; but this is nothing more than maintaining, in other words, the total moral corruption, and obstinacy in rebellion, of the unrenewed heart. Hence he says, pp. 148, 149, "As to *natural* capacity, all mankind are *capable* of a perfect conformity to this law. The sinning angels have the same *natural* capacities now, as they had before they fell. Adam, after his fall, had the same soul that he had before, as to his *natural capacities*. When sinners are converted, they have no new *natural* faculties, though they have a new temper. The law is exactly upon a level with our *natural* capacities. There can be nothing to render it, in any measure, a *hard* and *difficult* thing to love God with all our hearts, but our being destitute of a *right temper of mind*, and having a *temper* that is *wrong*; and therefore, we are perfectly *inexcusable, wholly to blame*, that we do not."

How much Dr. Bellamy's views differed from those of some writers, who allege, that whatever is such an *inability*, that it cannot be overcome by any thing less than almighty power, must, of course, be a merely *physical inability*, and consequently *innocent*, the following extracts will suffice to show.

"If a sinful creature's not being able to help his being of a bad temper, does in the least free him from blame, then the more vile and sinful any creature grows, the less to blame will he be.—If we are so averse to God that we *cannot* love him; and if our bad temper is so strong, so settled, and rooted, that we *cannot* get rid of it; this is so far from being matter of excuse for us, that it renders us so much the more vile, guilty, and hell-deserving. The *more unable* to love God we are, the *more are we to blame*."—p. 155, 156.

Agreeably to his general system, and the current language of Calvinistic divines, Dr. Bellamy ascribes *Regeneration* to an immediate and special act of divine power, in distinction from the influence of external motives, or the much boasted moral suasion of the Arminian school.

"From all that has been said, we may learn that *those influences of the Spirit*, which will be sufficient *effectually* to awaken, convince and humble the sinner, and recover him to God, must be *irresistible* and *supernatural*. If they are altogether unwilling to see, &c., then they must be brought to it by an *all-conquering, irresistible* grace, or not at all.—If the clearest sight and greatest sense a natural man can have of what *God is*, instead of making him appear infinitely glorious and amiable, &c., will rather irritate corruption, and make the native enmity of the heart ferment and rage, as has been heretofore proved; then there must be a *supernatural, spiritual and divine* change wrought in the heart, by the *immediate* influences of the Spirit of God." p. 236, 237.

"If the true and real character of God itself is odious to a carnal heart, the idea of that character will excite, not love, but dislike. We are *dead in sin*; as perfectly dead, as the body of Christ was when it lay in the grave. And the same power which raised that from the dead, doth raise us from spiritual death. And we know, that a dead corpse must be restored to life, in order of nature, before it can see or hear." Vol. III. p. 308, 309.

It is not easy to see how these deductions can be avoided, consistently with the genuine laws of scriptural interpretation, or with the recognition of an *essential* difference between the character of saints, and that of sinners. If all that the impenitent need to lead them to the Saviour, be an increase of intellectual light, or new speculative perceptions, then it would seem, that they are to be pitied for their ignorance, rather than blamed for their perversity.

On the nature and extent of the *Atonement*, the statements and reasonings of Dr. Bellamy are peculiarly happy; but, instead of making quotations, or attempting to condense his thoughts, we would earnestly recommend to our readers the patient study of what he has written upon the subject, under the third head of his second discourse.

Besides "True Religion Delineated," the first volume contains a treatise on the "Divinity of Christ;" an ingenious

Discourse on "the Millennium;" and an Election Sermon, preached before the General Assembly of Connecticut, May 13, 1762.

In his "Four sermons on the wisdom of God in the permission of sin," and in his "Vindication," he has treated a much controverted subject, in a manner peculiarly adapted to convince the understanding, and affect the heart. It will be a difficult task to confute his arguments, so long as the Scriptures are of divine authority, and God, as the creator and governour of the world, shall continue to be possessed of absolute perfection.

His doctrine is, that "a sight of the wisdom of God in the permission of sin, is very useful to promote holiness of heart and life;" and after proving this position by a few scriptural examples, he defines the phrase, "permitting sin," vindicates the divine wisdom in such permission, and closes with remarks and an application, highly practical, awakening, and spiritual. By God's permitting sin, is not intended any thing inconsistent, either with his utter hatred of it, on its own account, or with the freedom of the sinner's will; but merely, his neglecting to hinder it, for the reason, that in every instance of its actual occurrence, he judges that, all things considered, it would not be best to prevent its existence, and, therefore, his conduct in suffering it to take place, is not only justifiable, but praiseworthy.

In proving the divine wisdom in permitting sin, Dr. Bellamy begins with instances from Scripture, in which this wisdom is plainly asserted, and strikingly manifested; and then adduces some considerations of a more abstruse nature, illustrative of his general position.

We shall not attempt to give a synopsis of Dr. Bellamy's arguments on this subject; we refer our readers to the work itself; and shall merely lay before them a few thoughts, confirmatory of his general views.

God was originally under no necessity, save that of his own benevolence, to act at all as Creator; and if he had remained forever satisfied in the bare knowledge and contemplation of his own essential glories, the existence of evil, as of all things else *out of himself*, would have been impossible. In other words, if he had not chosen to act, there would have been no evil, as there would have been no creatures to commit sin, and to suffer punishment. This conclusion must be admitted, or it must be assumed that the Deity

is bound by a blind fate, or that beings exist independently of his choice and agency ; which is, substantially, the ancient Magian doctrine of two eternal principles, the one the source of all good, and the other, the necessary and indestructible fountain of all evil.

If it depended absolutely upon God whether there should be any creation, then most manifestly it depended upon him what that creation should be ; unless we suppose, that, though he was voluntary in beginning to act, he became afterwards a kind of passive instrument of the contingencies occurring among his own works.

As it respects *power*, therefore, God might have produced a different system, from that which does exist, in relation to its general nature, its extent, its specific details, and its ultimate results.

Every theory which admits these first principles of natural as well as of revealed religion, must, when divested of imposing verbiage and declamation, contain within it all the difficulties alleged against the hypothesis, that God permits evil for the sake of his own glory, or on account of the greater ultimate advantage of the universe.

Suppose sin to be the certain consequence of the introduction of a moral system ; it must still be allowed, that no such system would have existed, but by the choice of God ; that he might have made it more or less extensive, as it regards the greatness or number of the beings included in his original plan ; and that, in foresight of all the mischiefs it would occasion, he preferred the one he has chosen, to any other which is possible. He might have excluded sin, by having no moral agents. In determining to have such agents, therefore, he virtually decreed that sin should exist, to the extent of its actual occurrence ; and he did this, because he saw that thus a greater amount of good might be secured, than by any other means. If he did not form his purpose in this case, from a supreme regard to the general good, or to the welfare of what Edwards calls "being in general ;" it is hardly possible to clear his character from the imputation of malignity, in his giving existence to creatures, who he foresaw would fall, and involve themselves in eternal ruin.

The doctrine, that God has a right to form creatures, who, he foresees, will sin, and yet has no right to permit those to sin, whose disobedience he can hinder consistently

with their liberty, or the maintenance of a system of moral agency, must proceed on the gratuitous and absurd assumption, that he is less responsible for the consequences of his conduct as Creator, than as Governour, or rather that he is perfectly justifiable in doing that in the former character, which he could not do in the latter, without an utter disregard of righteousness. Are any prepared to say this? If there is any difficulty in his not hindering the sin of creatures when he can prevent it, is there not the same difficulty in his giving existence to creatures, who can and will sin?

The objection to Dr. Bellamy's theory, that it represents God as doing evil that good may come, (besides its assuming the erroneous principle, that it is evil in God as the Head of the Universe, to manage its concerns in such a manner, as most effectually to secure its highest welfare,) has the same force in opposition to the notion that sin is the certain consequence of a moral system, as to the theory against which it is specifically urged. If it is wrong to permit evil for the sake of the good which is to ensue, is it not, for the same reason, wrong to choose a system, which, from its very nature, cannot fail to include the evil, notwithstanding all possible influences to the contrary? Suppose that an individual, were this possible, should fabricate a self-moving machine, in certain foresight of the fact, that it would, in the course of its operations, destroy a definite number of lives;—would he not be as responsible for the disastrous result, as he would have been, had it been expressly included in his original plan? What if he should plead, that the destruction of life was not his *direct object*,—though he made such a catastrophe inevitable, by forming the machine, and actually perferred the existence of the evil to an abandonment of his purpose,—would his apology be admitted as satisfactory? If the Most High was benevolent in choosing a moral system, it was because he knew that such a system would be productive of greater good than any other; and of course, he felt himself justified in permitting sin to take place, for the sake of those higher interests, which he knew would not be so well secured by its exclusion.

It has been said, that according to Dr. Bellamy's theory, sin is a good thing, and the more of it the better; whereas, what he especially labours to establish, is, the supreme wisdom of God, in making use of that, which is *in its nature only*

*evil* as the means of displaying, in the highest degree, the glory of his immaculate righteousness, of his benevolence, and of all his perfections. And this is substantially the doctrine of all Calvinists, who maintain that God permits evil, with reference to the more extensive prevalence which will thereby be secured of holiness and happiness. The objection, fairly carried out, would imply a want of goodness in God, in decreeing the existence of *natural* evil, for the sake of the benefits with which it is connected; for it might be urged, with no less plausibility than was the inference with respect to sin in the former case, that on this principle, pain is a good thing, and the more of it the better.

Dr. Bellamy's theory has been met by the objection, that it is inconsistent with the sincerity of God, in his commands, invitations, and frequent and earnest warnings against sin. But is it not plain, without entering into any philosophical discussion of the subject, that the difficulty is as great, on any hypothesis, which admits the elementary doctrines of natural religion, as on that, against which it is in this instance alleged? On any supposition, compatible with a belief of the omniscience, or foreknowledge and supremacy of God, he gave existence to the present system, and cannot consistently with his wisdom, prevent those acts of disobedience, which do occur. He did not purpose to prevent them, when he gave being to the guilty actors. His commands are given, therefore, without any expectation that obedience will be rendered by any, except those, whose holiness he had from the beginning determined to secure. Is there no difficulty here to such narrow and darkened minds as ours? How can he be *sincere*,—the proud caviller might ask,—in *commanding* his creatures to perform actions, which from circumstances arranged and determined by himself, he *knows*, and consequently has made it *certain*, that they *will not do*? Does it add any embarrassment to the subject, as it regards his *sincerity* in his requirements and offers of salvation, to say that he purposes to glorify himself by means of the sins of his creatures? Not in the least. Sin is as odious in itself, as contrary to the nature of God, and as malignant in its tendency, allowing that, in his infinite wisdom, it is designed and overruled for good, as it would be, were it to proceed unrestrained, to the utter destruction of all created happiness, and the subversion of his throne itself. Who will pretend that persecution is any the

less hateful, or ought any the less to be forbidden, because by means of it the souls of the faithful are purified, and because, in the mysterious counsels of heaven, the blood of the martyrs proves to be the seed of the church?

As it regards the free agency of creatures, it is no more abridged by Dr. Bellamy's theory, than by any other that can be conceived; for it has been a thousand times demonstrated, that the vaunted Pelagian liberty of contingency, or self-determination, is a mere chimera of the brain; or, were it true, it would be destructive of the very elements of intelligent and responsible conduct. It is the liberty of acting *without* and *against* all governing motives and reasons; which is, in other words, the liberty of acting in absolute blindness, and ignorance, and indifference to the objects of choice. The simple statement of the doctrine carries with it its utter refutation.

In most of the objections to the theory under consideration, the rights of God, as the universal Creator and Governour, are virtually denied, or overlooked. It is forgotten, that infinite righteousness demands of the Lord of all, a scheme and process of government, commensurate with the magnitude of the interests which are, by necessity, sustained and managed by his agency. As we are his property, it is infinitely becoming in him to employ us, and all that we have for his glory. "Have I not a right to do what I will with mine own?" How could God be just to himself, and to his kingdom, should he, from a partial regard to the welfare of individuals, neglect the adoption of any means which were necessary to the promotion of those objects of benevolence for which he made, and rules the world? "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel to honour, and another to dishonour?" Our confidence in the Holy One of Israel is this, that, as he reigns over all, so he will suffer nothing to take place, which shall not be seen in the end to have contributed, directly or indirectly, to the manifestation of his glory:

"From partial evil, still educing good,  
And better still—in infinite progression."

The hypothesis, that God permits the existence of sin, for the sake of the augmented holiness and happiness of which he purposes to make it the occasion, has many advantages to recommend it to the understanding and heart of

the enlightened Christian, especially as compared with the doctrine that sin is, in no sense, the object of the divine choice, but is merely *incidental* to the best possible system.

With what propriety, according to the latter theory, can the Most High be said to *predetermine* or *permit* sin? *Permit* what he cannot help, if he will have moral agents! The word ought not to be used; for, on this supposition, the *permission* of sin might with as good reason, be attributed to Gabriel, or Abraham, as to the Creator. What nonsense it would be, to speak of a mechanic as *permitting* that friction, which he in no sense chooses, which is an essential quality of all material substances, and which hinders the complete success of his experiments?

How can God be *benevolent*, in producing a system which he knows will go wrong, and which he foresees it will not be in his power to govern? Is not he, who voluntarily lets loose an *unmanageable* wild beast upon the community, answerable for all the consequences of this act of cruelty, or thoughtlessness?

The hypothesis to which I refer, is a virtual denial of God's justice in punishing sin. Is it doing evil that good may come, for God to permit sin, on account of the superiour advantages which he designs to secure, by means of its introduction? Why then, for the same reason, must not this horrible imputation adhere to his character, provided that he punishes sin, in reference to the advantages of punishment to his empire at large? Yea, on this principle, he ought not, in any manner, as we have already intimated, to be accessory to any kind of suffering; for this would be doing evil that good might come; and, whenever suffering does occur, it is necessary, in order to the vindication of his character, that it should be understood as a *contingent*, or *incidental* result of "the best possible system." Under the heavy load of complicated calamities, therefore, we ought to say, "It is not our benevolent Creator who afflicts us; far from us be a suggestion so blasphemous; but our afflictions are simply fortuitous occurrences, unavoidably attendant on the *best possible system*."

But how is this hypothesis consistent with the Bible? There Jehovah claims it as his prerogative to manage the hearts of men as he pleases, and to elicit good from evil. "There are many devices in a man's heart, nevertheless, the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand.—The heart of a king

is in the hand of the Lord ; and he turneth it whithersoever he will.—The preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue, are from the Lord.—Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.—Of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel *determined before* (*προσώριον*) to be done.”

All *sincere* prayers for divine influence to renew the hearts of sinners, or to restrain their wickedness, are offered on the ground of God's ability to accomplish these effects with infallible certainty, while the beings upon whom he acts, retain the full exercise of all their powers, as moral and accountable agents. The same inference undeniably follows from the promises of God concerning the perseverance of his children in holiness, the safety of the church, and the final universal triumph of truth and righteousness. With what propriety can he promise that which he is unable to fulfil? or, if the events foretold should take place, how, provided that they were efficiently produced without his agency, would their occurrence be viewed as an evidence of his faithfulness, or as affording any ground of praise to the eternal King of Zion? He declares that he will give a new heart to his chosen, and repair the desolations of the church, *for his great name's sake* ; and thus he teaches, at once, his supreme power and efficiency, and the decisive *reasons* of his conduct, in achieving results so glorious.

God expressly assures us, that all the evil which does take place, is permitted on account of the good with which it is connected in his wise designs. “Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee,” says the Psalmist, “the remainder of wrath wilt thou restrain.—For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.”

God makes use of the wickedness of bad men, to punish the sins of his people. Thus Sennacherib was sent against a hypocritical nation ; and Babylon, that scourge of the earth, was declared to be God's battle-axe, and his weapon of war. David recognized the divine agency, in the afflictions he endured, through the wicked conduct of his vindictive enemies. “Deliver my soul from the wicked, which is

thy sword." "So let him curse, because the Lord hath said unto him, curse David." The celebrated C. Wesley, forgetting his Arminianism, has given a just and beautiful paraphrase of this sentiment :

"Lord, I adore thy righteous will ;  
Through ev'ry instrument of ill,  
My Father's goodness see ;  
Accept the complicated wrong  
Of Shimei's hand and Shimei's tongue,  
As kind rebukes from thee."

We learn from the Scriptures, that the exhibition of the divine glory in redemption, was the principal design of God in creating the world ; and consequently, it was his purpose that sin, vile as it is in itself, should become the occasion of the greatest good. What else can be the meaning of Eph. 3: 9, 10, 11? "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ, *to the intent*, that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places," or, to the different orders of celestial intelligences, "might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose, which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." The same important doctrine is taught in Col. 1: 14—19.

The permission of sin becomes the occasion of the bright manifestation of divine justice on the one hand, and of the most triumphant and glorious display of divine mercy on the other ;—by means of which, as the felicity of the holy creation chiefly arises from *a discovery of God in his true character*, there is an augmentation of the happiness of the universe beyond all finite calculation. Luke 15: 7, "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, who need no repentance." This sentiment is repeatedly brought into view in the epistle to the Romans ; particularly in chap. 5: 20, 21, and chap. 11: 32—36.

But it is needless to multiply arguments. We cannot close our remarks on the "Sermons" and "Vindication," without commending them to the serious perusal of the candid and devout reader. He will find in them much to enlighten his understanding, to rectify his errors, to excite his gratitude, to inspire him with elevated confidence, hope, and joy, under all personal trials, and events that seem most

inauspicious to the cause of Zion, and the best interests of the world. While he will behold sin portrayed in its native deformity and odiousness, meriting and suffering the boundless displeasure of Heaven, he will at the same time see this monster made to reflect, from its scathed and tortured brow, the infinite glory of the divine JUSTICE, HOLINESS, TRUTH and LOVE. These are most sweet and comforting views to all who love the Lord, and pray for the peace of Jerusalem.

In his "Letters and Dialogues upon the nature of Love to God, Faith in Christ, and Assurance of a title to eternal life;" in his "Essay on the nature and glory of the gospel;" in his sermon entitled, "The law our schoolmaster;" and in his "Blow at the root of the refined Antinomianism of the present age;" Dr. Bellamy pursues his favourite themes—the immutable obligations of the law, and the distinguishing characteristics of Christian piety, with a perspicuity and power of argument, which have seldom been surpassed. Every species of religion, springing from self-love, or enthusiastic impulses, is exposed by his searching mind, and annihilated by his masterly reasoning. That his language is sometimes needlessly severe, is perhaps true; but he felt himself called, in Providence, to guard Christians against errors, which were sanctioned by great and beloved names; and it was not his "intention," as one of his contemporaries remarks, "to detract from the character of such worthy men as Hervey and Marshal, or to hinder the perusal of their writings. In these, no doubt, he saw many excellencies." While he rejoiced in the truths they defended, he was not unwilling, as a servant of Christ, to bear testimony against the mistakes by which they gave countenance to a selfish, superficial and merely periodical religion, and encouraged the hope of an *immediate witness of the Spirit*, amounting to little less than strict inspiration. On the reality, nature, and grounds of a scriptural assurance of salvation, there is nothing, perhaps, superiour to his third Dialogue, which, were it faithfully studied, could hardly fail to serve as an effectual antidote to certain fanatical opinions, which have their admirers and advocates at the present day. A single extract will suffice.

"Besides, my dear Theron, how will you know whether your immediate revelation comes from God, or from the devil? Leave holiness out of the account, and what is there

of this kind, but what the devil can do? If he can, how do you know but he will? How do you know but he does? Go to the Anabaptists in Germany, in Luther's time; go to the enthusiasts in England, in Cromwell's time, and see what the devil has done in former ages. Yea, I could name towns and persons in New-England, where and in whom Satan's mighty works have been to be seen, within less than twenty years." Vol. II. p. 294, 295.

The churches might be preserved from such delusions, were the friends of Scriptural Christianity as zealous and untiring in the cause of truth, as are the advocates of a spurious religion in multiplying their converts. Cowper has well said,

"No wild enthusiast ever yet could rest,  
Till half mankind were like himself possessed."

Dr. Bellamy has treated at great length, and in his usually forcible and convincing manner, what was sometimes called "the half-way practice,"—a custom, then extensively prevalent in New-England, of admitting to baptism the children of parents not in full communion, on the condition of their "owning the covenant," or publicly avouching Jehovah to be their God. It was introduced by a Synod that met in Boston, in 1662, with the design of favouring such parents as had conscientious scruples respecting their right to the Lord's table; and in order that the descendants of the Puritans might be distinguished by some visible badge, from the heathen. It was certainly an innovation, not recognized in the Saybrook Platform, nor once alluded to in the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Directory of the church of Scotland. To justify it, many curious and subtle distinctions were introduced; and few men were better qualified than Dr. Bellamy, to disentangle the intricate web, which the defenders of the practice had ingeniously woven for its protection. His various works on this almost forgotten subject,\* aside from their main design, will well repay the trouble of an attentive perusal, as the productions of a powerful intellect, as opening to our view a

\* This practice was sometimes assailed by ridicule. Thus an individual who had offered his children in baptism, without coming to the communion, is humourously described with

"One foot within the pale of church  
The other out of doors."

singular chapter in the history of former religious opinions, and as containing a lucid statement and vindication of some of the more important and practical doctrines of Christianity.

We find, that there is no new thing under the sun. Mr. Mather, the antagonist of Dr. Bellamy in this controversy, imputed the most absurd and odious doctrines to those whom he opposed. He charged them, particularly, with holding, "That the enmity of the carnal mind against God, consists in disinterested malice; that in regeneration, new natural faculties are created in us; that the unregenerate, being without these new natural faculties, let their hearts be ever so good, are under a natural impossibility of hearkening to the call of the gospel; that we must be willing to be damned, in order to be prepared for Christ; that Christ has no hand in our reconciliation to God." Dr. Bellamy, in his reply, says, "I was never acquainted with any man, or any book, which held these points." Nothing can be easier than a gross caricature of the sentiments of those, who maintain the faith once delivered to the saints. Mr. Mather had insinuated, that the sacramental controversy turned on these preposterous doctrines,—thus virtually imputing such nonsense and impiety to Baxter, Watts, Guise, Doddridge, Henry, Flavel, the authors of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the first settlers of New-England, Edwards, Bellamy, and a multitude of others, who were both the champions and ornaments of the Gospel of Christ. Such is the pure *odium theologicum*, which discolours and distorts every object, on which it fixes its jaundiced eye. Alas, poor human nature, when even the ministers of the Prince of Peace descend to chicanery, vituperation, and slander, in promoting principles which they profess to regard of vital importance to the honour of God, and the eternal well-being of their fellow-men!

The other works of Dr. Bellamy, published in the three volumes bearing his name, are "A Letter to Scripturista," vindicating the use of creeds and confessions in the churches; "Early Piety Recommended," in a discourse on Eccles. 12: 1; and "A Sermon," on "the great evil of sin as committed against God." In these, we observe the author's usual characteristics,—strong conceptions, a plain and energetic style, and zeal for the cause of truth and holiness.

Dr. Bellamy, and those with whom he was associated

in inculcating and defending evangelical truth, may well be called Christian philosophers of the purest school. They were not ambitious of novelties, or refinements of speculation. They sought neither inspiration, nor celebrity, amidst the groves of Academus and the rhapsodies of Plato, nor the scarcely less dreamy metaphysics of the Alexandrian Fathers. They brought to their researches the exactness of science, the simplicity of faith, and the ardour of piety,—but none of the enthusiasm of poetry, which forgets realities,

"And gives to airy nothing,  
A local habitation and a name."

They loved the Bible ; it was their constant manual ; and the only religious philosophy they desired to know, was that which could bear the searching, purifying scrutiny of the word of God. Were they not metaphysicians, then ? Yes—but metaphysicians of an "ethereal mould." They studied to discover, and to present to the minds of others, the beautiful connexions, the more than earthly harmony, of those varied dispensations of the moral government of God, which were published successively in Eden, at Mount Sinai, and in the song of the angels to the shepherds in Bethlehem. Did they talk of the faculties of the soul, and its sublime relations ? *They did*—but it was with profound submission to the revelations of Him who made the soul. They rightly judged, that all minds must be such as they were declared to be by their Creator ; and that, whatever errourists might allege, there could be no laws of mental operation, or moral agency, which should nullify those passages of Scripture that ascribe to man a character of utter depravity, and to Jehovah unlimited dominion over the hearts of his intelligent creatures. Sometimes, perhaps, they launched out into deep waters beyond their soundings ; but even then, their ship carried the Master, who could rebuke the surge, and return them in safety to the shore. Reason, with them, amidst all its aspirings and flights, which seemed at times scarcely human, was but the servant of revelation. Their originality, for which they have been sometimes blamed, was attributable as much to the depth of their pious affections, as to their vigorous grasp of intellect, and patience of application. If, in any instances, they followed the *ignis fatuus* of a visionary theory, it was perhaps to demonstrate to us the danger

of implicit reliance on any other authority than that of the inspired volume, the "entrance" of whose "words giveth life."

They deemed it to be the duty of Christians to labour after the most just and consistent views of the truths of the Bible. The precept, "In understanding be men," was taken in the literal sense. Thus holy Brainerd wrote a short time before his death, to a young gentleman, who was a candidate for the Christian ministry: "Labour to *distinguish* clearly upon experience and *affections* in religion, that you may make a difference between the *gold* and the shining *dross*: I say, labour here, if ever you would be a *useful minister of Christ*; for nothing has put such a stop to the work of God in this late day, as the false religion and the wild affections which attend it. Suffer me, therefore, finally, to entreat you earnestly to give yourself to prayer, to reading and meditation on divine truths; strive to penetrate to the bottom of them, and never be content with a superficial knowledge."

These great men, it is true, were not eminent critics and philologists. Does it follow, therefore, that they were not qualified to decide on Christian doctrines? They had the most essential qualifications of interpreters of the Sacred Writings, high powers of investigation, plain common sense, love of the truth, simplicity of purpose, and deep humility. "The meek will he guide in judgement; the meek will he teach his way." Oh! that their spirit were found, in its purity, patience and glowing zeal, in the heart of every instructor in our theological seminaries, of every preacher, of every student for the evangelical ministry, of every professed believer in Christendom!

The discrimination with which they judged of the character of revivals of religion, and professed conversions, was never more necessary than *now*. In an age of innovation and excitement, every thing new and strange will find admirers. Has the great enemy of our salvation changed his character? Is he not still the father of lies? Does he not still seek to transform himself into an angel of light? Is there no danger except on the side of inactivity and indifference to religion? Tinsel may glitter as much as gold. The unreflecting savage may part with the wealth that would have enriched him for a bauble; but shall we be so unwise?

The meteor's sudden flash may startle us more than the full-orbed brightness of the meridian sun. But is its light, therefore, as useful to guide us through the devious paths and perils of our journey? "It greatly concerns us," says Edwards, "to use our utmost endeavours clearly to discern, and have it well settled and established, wherein true religion does consist. Till this be done, it may be expected that great revivals of religion will be but of short continuance." He also observes, that "the consequences of neglecting to distinguish between saving affections and their counterfeits, are often inexpressibly dreadful."

It is trifling to say in reply to such appeals, "This is the age of action;—away with your musty and worm-eaten speculations; it is time to leave all controversies, and the senseless jargon of other days, and *go to work for the salvation of the world.*" Such is often the cry of ignorance and indiscreet zeal on the one hand, and of indolence and a time-serving policy on the other. True, the salvation of souls, next to the glory of God, should be the prime object of our prayers, our charities, our unceasing labours. But men, be it remembered, may be converted to error as well as to truth; to pharisaism as well as to humility; to a party as well as to Jesus Christ. False religion may swell them with pride and fantastic hopes, while it forges for them fetters stronger than adamant, and never to be dissolved but by death. A soul saved, or lost forever! How overwhelming the thought! The infinite magnitude of such a result impresses upon us, with resistless force, the deep necessity of a clear and practical recognition of the peculiar traits of the Christian character, and of those humbling doctrines, by which, as by a fire, the dross of all false religion is purged off and consumed. It will be of no advantage in the great day, to have reckoned on numerous converts, unless it shall appear, that they have been converts to the pure gospel, delivered from the power of Satan, and assimilated, in temper and life, to the meek and lowly Saviour.

## ART. IV. THEOLOGY A STRICTLY INDUCTIVE SCIENCE.

By Rt. Rev. B. B. Smith, Bishop of the Episcopal Church of the  
State of Kentucky.

It is remarkable that the discovery of the great principle of correct investigation was not made in connexion with those sciences which were most likely to suggest it ; but on the contrary, we are indebted to the very intricacies and delicacy of the science of mind for the developement of a principle which was not applied in the might of its simple power to the natural sciences, to which it now appears most akin, till centuries after it began to throw forms of proportion, of order, and of beauty over the most unsubstantial, and, until the days of Bacon, the most chaotic and absurd of all sciences, the science of mind, as previously taught for many generations. Chemistry, which now stands forth as most inductive of all sciences, was a strange medley of facts and theories, many years after mental philosophy and astronomy had undergone an entire transformation by the application of correct principles of philosophizing. But a curious enquiry here presents itself, whether mental philosophy, which first gave birth to the Baconian system, is not itself hereafter to be further modified by the operation of that very system, perfected as it has been, by subsequent application to more definite and tangible materials ?

In certain respects, the strange facts just noticed, might have been anticipated. For the mind of man, more curious to turn in upon itself, and to examine its own almost unsearchable structure, than to learn any of the facts connected with external nature, might be supposed to concentrate its highest powers most patiently in the study of itself. And the impossibility of arriving at any satisfactory conclusions on this subject, by ransacking the stores of antiquity, or observing loosely the motley and seemingly contradictory manifestations of mind, must have driven the stern inquirer, to adopt some orderly method of procedure which might lead to results exactly coinciding with nature and with truth. And, thus, the necessity of overcoming the greatest of difficulties, led to the discovery of a principle which removes all others with comparative ease.

A like conjecture would have rendered it probable that the very next subject to which this principle, after its discovery, would have been applied, would surely have been Theology. For, more perhaps, than the science of mind itself, did it, at that period, require some spirit of order and of power to brood over its chaotic materials, and to restore them the symmetry and perfection which they bore in earlier times, before a deluge of speculation and error had been poured in upon them by the pride and waywardness of polemics. And if mind, in its most concentrated energy, had achieved the discovery of the inductive principle in the study of its own powers, it might well have been supposed that the science of Theology, to which the same concentrated powers of mind had been devoted with more patient energy, on the part of far the greater proportion of men most highly endowed by nature, through so many successive generations, would have been reduced to perfect order, long before sciences, then esteemed, and justly esteemed, inferior sciences, had partaken of the benefit. The fact, however, has turned out differently. No science has yielded so slowly to the influence of the inductive principle as the science of Theology. And yet the natural sciences themselves scarcely solicit the application of this principle more strongly than Theology; and surely none have greater need of its application.

In proof of the fact that Theology, even to this day, is generally treated of *most uninductively*, let any one take pains to consult standard works in the department of SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, (as the term unfortunately goes). To his amazement he will find that hardly one, if one of them, gives even a common definition of the subject to be discussed, not one a history of it, as a separate subject of inquiry, and surely not one which even claims to treat of it as an inductive science, to be approached, analyzed, arranged, and exhibited precisely on the same principles upon which a philosophic writer would treat of either of the subordinate departments of Natural Philosophy.

And yet it is clear, that no science is more strictly inductive than Theology. The etymology of the term, is, as usual, a sort of definition of the science. It is that science which treats of God, in his essence, his character, his works and his word, and of the various relations which he sustains to all intelligent beings, all created things, and all possible

events, and of their corresponding relations to him. It places God, where he actually is, at the centre of all beings, all things, and all events, and calls upon us to learn HIM by studying them. Carry this study as far as we may, the manifestations of Jehovah may no more enable us to ascertain the very essence of the Deity, than the attributes of matter enable us to penetrate into the very essence or intricate nature of matter. But whilst we cleave to the facts, are guided by the facts, and pause where the facts terminate, we do learn a great deal concerning the nature, the character, the works and the ways of the Most High God.

This definition makes Theology, what it really is, the central science of all other sciences. If we knew enough of beings of an higher order than men, to construct a science out of the materials of that knowledge, still the whole science would have its peculiar relation to God, and thus would become only one of the branches of Theology; just as the science of mind, the science of moral feeling, the science of anatomy, and even the science of history, all having man for their object, may be complete sciences in themselves, but still, considering the higher relations of man to God, are only branches of the greatest of all sciences, Theology.

In like manner Astronomy, Geography, Mineralogy, Chemistry, and all the natural sciences, are only so many departments of the boundless field where God has left upon all things the impress of himself, and where, therefore, we are to study the Creator, by the light of the works of his hands, and the events of his providence. This is, indeed, an elevated, but surely a correct view of the greatness of THEOLOGY, which may, by way of eminence, justly be denominated the CENTRAL SCIENCE.

How different a view of Physics is this, from that derogating, and even profane view which has sometimes been taken, according to which nature is placed at the centre of each science respectively, and the disjointed mass, severed from the centre of light and heat, has been made to teach lessons of downright Atheism; whereas, when all the departments of science are permitted to point, as they do spontaneously, to the centre of the vast system, they point to a glorious, intelligent sun, and that sun the God of the Universe.

The moment it is definitely settled that Theology is an  
VOL. II. 12

inductive science, the mind is looking abroad for the materials of the science. For if we are to arrive at general truth by the careful induction of separate facts, the question instantly occurs, what are the facts? and how may access be had to them? Just as the botanist or the mineralogist must first collect specimens of plants and minerals, before they can proceed to that nice analysis and comparison, which will enable them to reduce the whole into subjection to general laws. All beings, all things, and all events are but so many manifestations of God; all these, therefore, form the inconceivably rich and varied and boundless material, out of which the theologian is to construct the noble science to which he is devoted.

Even before they are very minutely examined, these multifarious and almost infinite materials, naturally fall into a certain order. None can be more simple than the customary three-fold division, of the book of nature, the book of providence, and the book of revelation. Under the first division will be comprised all those facts which are technically comprehended in the word *Physics*; in the second, all those events in which intelligent beings are concerned, under the government of God; and in the third, all those higher and more glorious manifestations of himself which are recorded in the Bible. The book of nature teaches us that there is a God of inconceivable power and wisdom. The book of providence teaches us that he is a moral being, possessed of very high attributes of justice and goodness. The book of revelation teaches us, that there is one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, and one Holy Spirit, who spake by the prophets, constituting the one only living and true God; that this one God is a Spirit, infinite in power and wisdom, and infinite in mercy and truth; and that besides him there is no God.

It is remarkable, that of these three departments of the boundless field where the materials are to be sought for the construction of an inductive system of Theology, only the first has been fairly and fully examined on the principles of the inductive philosophy. That class of works commonly entitled *NATURAL THEOLOGY*, has been constructed upon a laborious induction of facts, to prove from the *material* works of his hands, that there is a God of great power and wisdom. Further than this, the first book of nature does not go; and its well instructed students pretend to derive

from it no further knowledge of God, than that of his being, and his very great power and wisdom.

But when the inquirer passes on to the book of providence, to that class of subjects treated of with such clearness and power by Butler in his *Analogy*, and by all the writers on Ethics, and the moral of History, and by the advocates of that cold and barren system, generally known by the term *Natural Religion*, he is amazed to find, that with the exception of the immortal Butler, few, if any, have been humble and docile students of the facts in the case, according to the principles of the inductive philosophy. But, inasmuch as the materials upon this portion of the field could only lead us imperfectly to spell and guess out the very same moral attributes of Jehovah, which it was the very design of the facts of revelation, to set forth in the clearest and most convincing point of view, the defect which has been mentioned is less to be deplored.

It is sad indeed to observe that the truths of the Book of Revelation have, most commonly, been approached in a far different spirit from that which becomes an inductive inquirer! From the days of Origen to this hour, philosophy, falsely so called, has first adjusted a preconceived system by the aid of a pernicious education, prejudices, or imagination, and has thus proceeded to string the facts of Scripture upon this three-fold cord, and to torture them into the requisite shape, whether they would or not. This spirit has shed a noiseless, unseen, but most deleterious influence over the theology of our own country, and in no section of it, perhaps, more fatally, than that where theology has been most studied. A metaphysical system, in strange and extreme contradiction to the inductive system, seems to have guided some of their most highly gifted inquirers. And it is much to be feared, that this dereliction of the only sound principle of investigation, will hereafter lead to a much wider departure from simple scriptural truth, than the devotees of metaphysical theology seem at present to apprehend.

Simply state the case inductively, that the Bible is a record of words and facts which embody the revelation of God to mankind, and the duty instantly becomes obvious, of analysing those words and facts, reducing them, by a method strictly inductive, into a proper order, and then, of deducing from them the legitimate general truth. As the beau-

tiful and living carpet which covers and adorns the earth is the proper field of the botanist, so the Bible is the proper field of the theologian; and the words and facts of the Bible are as much the materials of his science to the one, as plants and trees are to the other. Each should proceed with patient induction, and the general law or doctrine to which each will thus arrive, must be the truth.

Select for example the words and facts which relate to the existence, the nature and the attributes of God, directly considered; and to whatever general law or doctrine, the words and facts of Scripture inductively examined and arranged conduct, that is the truth on this subject, as far as God has been pleased to make it known. In like manner, select, analyze, and arrange the words and facts which relate to the soul of man, its essence, moral character and final destiny, and the doctrine, inductively deduced from them, is the truth. The same process should, most evidently, be adopted in reference to every particular point to which the Scriptures relate. And where the position is less directly approachable, and is, in any degree, matter of argument and inference, here, as in all other inductive sciences, the premises should be sustained by their facts, the chains of reasoning and the conclusion by theirs—all and each sustained and proved by express warrant of Scripture.

This method would soon land the theological student where the student of nature almost instantly finds himself under the guidance of correct philosophy, standing firmly upon the facts, without much danger of being bewildered by the theories with which they have been blended, or to which they have been made subservient. He will soon feel fully established in the *FACT* of the existence of one God; and the *manner* of his existence, as three persons and one God, will no more perplex him, than the fact that the brain is the seat of volition, will be perplexed by the question how nervous influence is diffused in order to carry volition into action. The fact of the immortality of the soul, will then be easily separated from all curious speculations upon the essence of the soul. The fact of spiritual regeneration by the Holy Ghost will then be dissevered from all nice questions as to the mode of the Spirit's operations. And, in general, the facts of Christianity, establishing all its prominent and essential doctrines, will be the truth to which the student will hold, with calm certainty, whilst the specula-

tions with which they have been entangled, will simply serve to amuse or to amaze him, whilst he weeps over the vagaries of which the mind of man has been capable.

It would certainly seem as if it were high time that this method of learning and teaching the science of Theology were understood and practised by all those who are training young men for the ministry, or at least in those schools where the sacred sciences are exclusively taught. Were this the case, and were our religious periodicals imbued with the same spirit, it would not be long before those weighty and impulsive productions which emanate from living ministers on the Lord's day, would be cast in the same mould; and the slow process commenced, by which the common mind of the great body of Christian people, would be elevated above the entanglements of party, to which a feverish existence is given, only by a mystical, mistaken, or pernicious theory, relative to some unexplained or unintelligible point in polemics.

The better educated and more reflecting classes of persons are those which first repose on correct principles of investigation. It is a slow process to raise the common mind from that unhappy level where the mists of error and the demons of party spirit delight to fix their abode; and where, strange to say, the common mind seems delighted to find itself, were it only for the sake of the excitement ministered by its own superstitions. A most torturing belief in supernatural beings and appearances, has very reluctantly and slowly given way to a correct philosophy, which delivers the imagination from this degrading and yet seductive thralldom.

In like manner, it may take a long time before plain, simple, scriptural Theology, constructed wholly out of the facts, and calmly contented simply with the facts, will take the place of a misty and vague kind of speculation upon the subject, which stimulates the imagination and the passions of men, and converts them into ferocious partizans; but the time will come, may the God of truth and of peace hasten the day! when the memory of our present religious controversies will seem as strange to us or to our children, as the memory of the dreams of the alchymist, or the speculations of the schoolmen. That principle which has set men right on other subjects, will not permit their minds forever to rove at random on that most inductive of all sciences, the science of Theology.

ART. V. MYTHOLOGY, SUPERSTITIONS AND LANGUAGES  
OF THE NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS.

By HENRY R. SCHOOLCRAFT, Esq., Michilimackinac, Michigan.

*Constitution of the Algic Society, for encouraging Missionary effort in evangelizing the North Western Tribes, &c., with an abstract of its Proceedings. Detroit, 1833. pp. 23.*

*The Gospel according to St. John. Translated into the Chippewa. By Peter Jones. London, 1831.*

It is known that the Indian tribes of this continent live in a state of mental bondage to a class of men, who officiate as their priests and soothsayers. These men found their claims to supernatural power on early fastings, dreams, ascetic manners and habits, and often, on some real or feigned fit of insanity. Most of them affect a knowledge of charms, and practice incantations. Availing themselves of the popular superstition of their tribes-people, which animates the air with spirits of benignant or malign character, they arrogate a power over these myriads of the imagination, and thus dispense the awards of fate to their infatuated countrymen. Unlike the Magi, whom they strikingly resemble, or the priests of a more splendid era of mythological fable, they are surrounded by no circumstances of outward pomp. The simple wrapper that covers a warrior's breast, or the frontlet that decorates his brow, suffices for the priest. He, indeed, affects humility in dress, and is often the most meanly clad person in the village. But the response which he utters from beneath a cone of deerskins, is invested with as much solemnity, as if it issued from the most sacred recesses of Delphos.

Some of these men acquire a character for wisdom, and skill in divination, which draws votaries from distant tribes, and their names are spread abroad as prophets. They were denominated *powwows*, in the early settlement of the country; and are frequently referred to, in the journals of modern travellers, as medicine men, jugglers, and Wabenos,—terms not perfectly synonymous, but which we find it convenient to class together. It is seldom, in the history of the tribes, that one of these men has acquired celebrity, without his falling into the hands of some ambitious leader, who has

employed him for political purposes; as may be instanced in the success of Buckanjahela, Little Turtle, Tecumseh, and Black Hawk.

We have recently had an opportunity of conversing with one of this class of persons, who has, within late years, embraced Christianity; and having made some notes of the interview, we will advert to it for the purpose of exhibiting his testimony, as to the true character of this class of impostors. Chusco, whose private history we intend briefly to relate, is an Indian who has long exercised the priestly office, so to say, to his brethren on the northern frontiers. He is now a man turned of seventy. He is of small stature, somewhat bent forward, and supports the infirmities of age by walking with a staff. His sight is impaired, but his memory is accurate, enabling him to narrate, with particularity, events which occurred more than half a century ago. He was present at the great convocation of northern Indians, which followed Gen. Wayne's victories in the west, and to which most of these tribes look back, as an era in their history. We requested him to narrate to us the facts of his conversion to the principles of Christianity, indicating the effect of truth on his mind. He did this, in substance, as follows:

"In the early part of my life, I lived very wickedly, following the Meta, the Jejukan, and the Wabeno, the three great superstitious observances of my people. I did not know that these societies were made up of rank and sinful errors, till my wife, whose heart had been turned by the missionaries, informed me of it. I had no pleasure in listening to her, and often turned away, declaring that I was satisfied with the religion of my forefathers. She took every occasion of talking to me on the subject. She told me that the Indian societies were bad, and that all who adhered to them, were no better than open servants of the Evil Spirit. She had, in particular, *four* long talks with me on the subject, and explained to me who God was, and what sin was, as it is written in God's book. I believed, before, that there was *one* Great Spirit, who was the master of life, and had made men and beasts. But she explained to me the true character of this Great Spirit, the sinfulness of the heart, and the way of having it turned from evil to good, by praying through Jesus Christ. By degrees I came to understand it. She told me that the Ghost of God only could make the

heart better, and that the souls of all who died, without having felt this power, would be burned in the fires existing in *mudjeemonedonong*. The missionaries had directed her to speak to me, and put words in her mouth; and she said so much, that I did not feel satisfied with my old way of life. Among other things, she spoke against drinking, which I was very fond of. I did not relish these conversations, but I could not forget them. When I reflected upon them, my heart was not as fixed as it used to be. I began to see that the Indian societies were bad, for I knew from my own experience, that it was not a Good Spirit that I had relied upon. I determined that I would not undertake to look into futurity any longer for the Indians, nor practise the Meta's art. After a while, I began to see, more fully, that the Indian ceremonies were all bad, and I determined to quit them altogether, and give heed to what was declared from God's book.

"The first time that I felt I was a sinner, and that I was in danger of being punished for sin, by God, is clearly in my mind. I was then on an island, making sugar, with my wife. I was in a conflict of mind, and hardly knew what I was about. I walked around the kettles, and did not know what I walked for. I felt sometimes, like a person wishing to cry, but I thought it would be unmanly to cry. For the space of two weeks, I felt in this alarmed and unhappy mood. It seemed to me sometimes, as if I *must* die. My heart and my bones felt as if they would burst and fall asunder. My wife asked me, if I was sick, and said I looked pale. I was in an agony of body and mind, especially during *one* week. It seemed, during this time, as if an Evil Spirit haunted me. When I went out to gather sap, I felt conscious that this Spirit went with me. It appeared to animate my own shadow.

"My strength was failing under this conflict. One night, after I had been busy all day, my mind was in great distress. This shadowy influence seemed to me, to persuade me to go to sleep. I was tired, and I wished to rest, but I could not sleep. I began to pray. I kneeled down, and prayed to God. I continued to pray, through the night. I then lay down, and went to sleep. Here I date my peace. In the morning my wife awoke me, telling me it was late. When I awoke I felt placid and easy in mind. My distressing fullness had also left me. I asked my wife what day it was.

She told me it was the Sabbath (in the Indian, prayer-day). I replied, how I wish I could go to the church at the Mission. Formerly, I used to avoid it, and shunned those who wished to speak to me of praying to God, but now my heart longs to go there. This feeling did not leave me.

"After three days, I went to the Mission. The gladness of my heart continued the same, as I had felt it the first morning at the sugar camp. My first feeling when I landed, was pity for my drunken brethren, the Indians, and I prayed that they might also be brought to find the true God, and to find peace through God's Son. I spoke to the Missionary (Rev. Mr. F.) who, at subsequent interviews explained to me the rite of baptism, and the taking of God's bread and wine. They wished, however, to try me by my life, and I wished it also. It was the autumn after the next following summer, that I was received into the church."

We now turned his mind to the subject of intemperance in drinking, understanding that it had been his former habit. He replied that he had been one of the greatest drunkards living. He had not been satisfied with a ten days' drink. He would go on, and drink, as long as he could get it. He said that, during the night in which he prayed to God, it was one of the subjects of his prayers, that God would remove this desire, with his other evil desires. He added, "God did so!" When he arose, that morning, the desire had left him. The Evil Spirit then tempted him, by suggesting to his mind, "Should some one now enter, and offer you liquor, would you not taste it?" He averred he could, at that moment, firmly answer, "No!" It was now seven years since he had tasted a drop of strong drink. He remarked, that when he used first to visit the houses of Christians, who gladly opened their doors to him, they were in the habit of asking him to drink a glass of cider or wine, which he did. But this practice had nearly ruined him. On *one* occasion he felt the effects of what he had drank. The danger he felt himself to be in, was such, that he was alarmed, and gave up these drinks also.

He detailed some providential trials, which he had been recently exposed to. He had observed, he said, that those of his people who had professed piety, and had subsequently fallen off, had, nevertheless, prospered in worldly things, while he had found it very hard to live. He was often in a state of want, and his lodge was so poor and bad, that it

would not keep out the rain. Both he and his wife were feeble, and their clothes were worn out. They had now but a single blanket between them. But when these trials came up in his mind, he immediately resorted to God, who satisfied him.

Another trait in the character of his piety, may here be mentioned. The autumn succeeding his conversion, he went over to the spot on the island, where he had planted potatoes. The Indian method is, not to visit their small plantations from the time that their corn or potatoes are hilled. He was pleased to find that the crop in this instance, promised to yield abundantly, and his wife immediately commenced the process of raising them. "Stop!" exclaimed the grateful old man. "Dare you dig these potatoes until we have thanked the Lord for them?" They then both kneeled in prayer, and afterwards gathered the crop.

This individual appeared to us, to form a tangible point in the intellectual chain between Paganism and Christianity, which it was important to examine. We felt desirous of drawing from him such particulars respecting his former practices in necromancy, as might lead to correct philosophical conclusions. He had been the great juggler of his tribe. He was now accepted as a Christian. What were his own conceptions of the power and arts he had practised? How did these things appear to his mind, after a lapse of several years, during which his opinions and feelings had undergone changes, in many respects so striking? We found not the slightest disposition to avoid this topic on his part. He attributed all his ability in the deceptive arts, to the agency of the Evil Spirit; and he spoke of it, with the same settled tone that he had manifested in reciting other points in his personal experience. He believed, that he had followed a lying spirit, whose object it was to deceive the Indians, and make them miserable. He believed, that this spirit had left him, and that he was now following, in the affections of his heart, the spirit of Christ.

Numerous symbols of the classes of animate creation are relied on, by the Indian Metas and Wabenos, to exhibit their pretended power of working miracles and scrutinizing futurity.

It is one of the strong points of coincidence between ancient and modern soothsaying, that the office is exercised for gain. And Chusco, like the damsel of Thyatira, acquired

"much gain by soothsaying." The insignia of this office, with our Indians, is usually a medicine sack, containing vegetable and metallic medicines and mystic implements, of every imaginable diversity. Not unfrequently, there are one or more carved or stuffed animals or birds, a cowrie shell, or the hollow bones of some of the larger anseres. Whatever be the symbol exhibited, spirits are appealed to, to give efficacy and aid. And these are as numerous, as there are objects in the whole visible creation.

The objects which this man had appealed to, as personal spirits in the arcana of his lodge, were, the tortoise, the swan, the woodpecker, the crane, and the crow. He had dreamed of these in his youth, during the period usually set apart for this purpose. And he believed that a satanic influence was exerted, by presenting to his mind one or more of these solemnly appropriated objects, at the moment of his invoking them. This is the theory drawn from his replies. We solicited him to detail the *modus operandi*, after entering the juggler's lodge. This lodge resembles a truncated cone, with the apex open. It is formed of poles, covered with tight drawn skins. His replies were perfectly ingenuous, evincing nothing of the natural taciturnity and shyness of the Indian mind. The great object with the operator, is to agitate this lodge, and cause it to move or shake, without uprooting it from its basis, in such a manner as to induce the spectators to believe, that the *power of action is superhuman*. After this manifestation of spiritual presence, the priest within is prepared to give oracular responses. The only articles within, are a drum and rattle. In reply to our inquiry as to the mode of procedure, he states, that in the days when he was guilty of this nefarious practice, his first essay, after entering the lodge, was to strike the drum, and commence his incantations. At this time, his personal manitos assumed their agency, and he received, it is to be inferred, a satanic energy. Not that he affects, there was any visible form assumed; but he felt their spirit-like presence. He represents the agitation of the lodge to be due to currents of air, having the irregular and gyratory power of a whirlwind. He does not pretend that his responses were guided by truth, but affirms that they were given under the influence of the Father of lies.

We interrogated him as to his use of physical and mechanical means in effecting cures, in the capacity of a Meta,

a medicine-man. He referred to various medicines, some of which, he thinks, are anti-bilious, or otherwise sanatory. He used two bones, in the exhibition of his physical skill, one of which was white, the other green. His arcanum also embraced two small stone images. He affected to look into, and through the flesh, and to draw from the body, fluids, as bile and blood. He applied his mouth in suction. He characterized both the Meta, or medicine dance, and the Wabeno, by a term which was translated to us, devil-work. Yet he discriminated between these two popular Indian institutions by adding, that the Meta included the use of medicines, good and bad. The Wabeno, on the contrary, consists wholly in a wild exhibition of mere braggadocio and trick. It is not, according to him, an ancient institution. It originated with a Pottawattomie, who was sick and lunatic, a month. When he recovered, he pretended that he had ascended to heaven, and had brought thence divine arts.

With respect to the opinion steadfastly maintained by this venerable subject of Indian reformation, that his deceptive arts were rendered effectual in the way *he* designed, by satanic agency, we leave the reader to form his own conclusions. In his mode of stating the facts to us, we concede much to him, on the score of long established mental habits, and the peculiarities arising from a mythology, exceeding even that of ancient Greece, for the number, variety, and ubiquity of its objects. But we perceive nothing heterodox in the general position. When the truth of the gospel comes to be grafted upon the benighted heart, it throws a fearful light on the objects which have been cherished there. The whole system of the mythologic agency of the gods and spirits of the heathen world, and all its clumsy machinery, is shown to be a sheer system of demonology, referable, in its operative effects on the minds of individuals, to the Prince of the power of the air. As such, the Bible depicts it. We have not been in the habit of conceding the existence of demoniacal possessions in the present era of Christianity, and have turned over some scores of chapters and verses, to satisfy our minds of the abrogation of these things. But we have found no proofs of such a withdrawal of evil agency, short of the very point where our subject places it—the dawning of the light of Christianity in the heart. We have, on the contrary, found in the passages referred to, the declaration of the full and free existence of satanic agency,

in the general import, and apprehend that the doctrine cannot be plucked out of the sacred writings.

The language of such an agency appears to be fully developed among the northern tribes. Spirit-ridden they certainly are. And the slavery in which they live, under the fear of an invisible agency of evil spirits, is greater even than the bondage of the body. The whole mind is bowed down under these intellectual fetters, which circumscribe its volitions, and bind it, as effectually as the hooks of iron, which pierce a whirling Hindoo's flesh. Whatever is wonderful, or past comprehension, to their minds, is referred to the agency of a spirit. This is the ready solution of every mystery in nature, and of every refinement of mechanical power in art. A watch is a spirit. A piece of blue cloth, cast and blistered steel, a compass, a jewel, an insect, &c. are respectively a spirit. Thunder consists of so many distinct spirits. The Aurora Borealis is a body of dancing spirits.

To give some idea of the Indian mythology, it is necessary to conceive every department of the universe to be filled with invisible spirits. These spirits hold, in their belief, nearly the same relation to matter, that the soul does to the body. They believe not only that every man, but also, *that every animal has a soul*. And, as might be expected, under this belief, *they make no distinction between instinct and reason*. Every animal is supposed to be endowed with a reasoning faculty. The movements of birds, and other animals, are deemed to be the result, not of mere instinctive animal powers, implanted and limited by the Creator, without inherent power to exceed or enlarge them, but of a process of ratiocination. They go a step farther, and believe that animals, particularly birds, can look into, and are familiar with the vast operations of the world of spiritual life. Hence the great respect they pay to birds, as agents of omen, and also to some animals, whose souls they expect to encounter in another life. Nay, it is the settled belief among the northern Indians, that animals will fare better in another world, in the precise ratio that their lives and enjoyments have been curtailed in this.

Dreams are considered by them, as a means of direct communication with the spiritual world, and hence the great influence which dreams exert over the Indian mind and conduct. They are generally regarded as friendly warnings of the personal manitos. No labour or enterprize is under-

taken against their indications. A whole army is turned back, if the dreams of the officiating priest are unfavourable. A family lodge has been known to be deserted by all its inmates, at midnight, leaving the fixtures behind, because one of the family had dreamt of an attack, and been frightened with the vision of blood and tomahawks. To give more solemnity to his office, the priest, or leading eta, exhibits a sack, containing the carved or stuffed images of animals, with medicines and bones, constituting the sacred reliqua. These are never exhibited to the common gaze, but the sack is hung up in plain view. To profane the medicine sack, would be like violating the altar. Dreams are carefully sought by every Indian, male and female, during youth, with fasting. These fasts are sometimes continued a great number of days, until the devotee becomes pale and emaciated. The animals that appear propitiously to the men, during these dreams, are fixed on, as personal manitos; and are ever after regarded as guardians. This period of fasting and dreaming is deemed as essential by them, as any religious rite whatever, by Christians.

The naming of children has an intimate connexion with the system of mythological agency. Names are usually bestowed by some aged person, most commonly the priest, under the supposed guidance of particular spirits. They are often derived from the mystic scenes presented in a dream, and refer to aerial phenomena. Yellow Thunder, Bright Sky, Big Cloud, Spirit Sky, Spot in the Sky, are common names for males. Females are more commonly named from the vernal or autumnal landscape, as Woman of the Valley, Woman of the Rock, &c. Females are excluded from participation in the priesthood, or jugglership. Not an instance of their having assumed this function is known to have occurred in the history of America. Both in this, and in every other department of life, they are apparently regarded as inclusive beings. Names bestowed with ceremony in childhood, are deemed sacred, and are seldom pronounced, out of fear or respect, it would seem, to the spirit under whose favour they are supposed to have been selected. Children are usually called, in the family, by some by-name, which can be familiarly used. A male child is very frequently called by the mother, bird, or young one, or old man, as terms of endearment; or bad boy, evil-doer, &c., in the way of light reproach; and these names often

adhere to the individual through life. Parents avoid the true name often, by saying, my son, my younger, or my elder son, or my younger or my elder daughter, for which the language has separate words.

The Indian "art and mystery" of hunting, is a tissue of mythologic reliances. The personal spirits are invoked to give success in hunting. Images of the animals sought for, are carved in wood, or drawn by the Metas on tabular pieces of wood, by applying the mystic medicines to which, the animals are supposed to be drawn into the hunter's path. And when animals have been killed, the Indian feels, that although they are an authorized and lawful prey, yet there is something like accountability to the animal's suppositional soul. An Indian has been known to ask the pardon of an animal which he had just killed. Drumming, shaking the rattle, and dancing and singing, are the common accompaniments of all their superstitious observances, and are not peculiar to one class alone. In the Wabeno dance, which is esteemed by the Indians, as the most latitudinarian, love songs are introduced.

The system of Manito-worship has another peculiarity, which is illustrative of Indian character. During the fasts and ceremonial dances, by which a warrior prepares himself to come up to the duties of war, every thing that savours of effeminacy is put aside. The spirits which preside over bravery and war, are alone relied on; and these are supposed to be offended by the votary's paying attention to objects less stern and manly than themselves. Venus and Mars cannot be worshipped at the same time. It would be considered a complete desecration for a warrior, while engaged in war, to entangle himself by any other but sentiments of Platonic love. We think this principle should be estimated in the general award which history gives to the chastity of Indian warriors. We would record the fact to his praise as fully as it has been done; but we would subtract something from the *motive*, in view of his paramount obligations of a sacred character, and also the fear of the ridicule of his co-warriors.

In these leading doctrines of an oral, and of course, somewhat varied school, may be perceived the ground work of their mythology, and the general motive for selecting familiar spirits. Maneto, or as the Indians pronounce it, Monedo, signifies simply *spirit*; and there is neither a good

nor bad meaning attached to it, when not under the government of some adjective or qualifying particle. We think, however, that so far as there is a meaning, distinct from an invisible existence, the tendency is to a bad meaning. A bad meaning is, however, distinctly conveyed by the inflection *ish*. The particle *wee*, added in the same relation, indicates witch. Like numerous other nouns, it has its diminutive in *os*, its plural in *wug*, and its local form in *ing*. To add "great," as the Jesuit writers did, is far from deciding the character of the spirit, and hence modern translators prefer *Gezha*, signifying merciful. Yet we doubt whether the word God, should not be carried boldly into these translations. In the conference and prayer room, the native teachers use the inclusive pronominal form of "Father," altogether. Truth breaks slowly on the mind, sunk in so profound a darkness as the Indian's, and there is danger in retaining the use of words like these, which they have so long employed in a problematical, if not a derogatory sense.

Vitality, in their forms of utterance, is deeply implanted in the Indian dialects, which provide by the process of inflection, for keeping a perpetual distinction between the animate and inanimate kingdoms. But where vitality and spirituality are so blended, as we see them, in their doctrine of animal souls, the inevitable result must be, either to exalt the principle of life, in all the classes of nature, into an immortal spirit, or to sink the latter to the level of mere organic life. Indian philosophy has taken the former dilemma, and peopled its paradise, not only with the souls of men, but with the souls of every imaginable kind of beasts. Spirituality is also clogged with sensual accidents. The human soul hungers, and it must have food deposited upon the grave. It suffers, and the body must be wrapped about with cloths. It is in darkness, and a light must be kindled at the head of the grave. It wanders through plains and across streams, subject to the providences of this life, in quest of its place of enjoyment; and when it reaches it, it finds every species of sensual trial, which render it, not indeed a heaven of rest, but another world, very much like this. Of punishments and rewards, we hear nothing; and the idea that the Master of life, or the merciful Spirit, will be alike merciful to all, irrespective of the acts of this life, or the degree of moral turpitude, appears to leave for their Theology, a

belief in deistical Universalism. There is nothing to refer them to a Saviour, and, of course, no occasion for the offices of the Holy Ghost. Darker and more chilling views it would be impossible to present. Yet, it may be asked, what more benign result could have been, or can now be anticipated, in the hearts of an ignorant and wandering people, exposed to sore vicissitudes, without the guidance of the light of Revelation?

Some of the mythologic existences of the Indians admit of poetic uses. Manabozho may be considered as a sort of terrene Jove, who could perform all things, but lived on earth, and excelled particularly in feats of strength and manual dexterity. All the animals were subject to him. He also survived a deluge, which their mythology provides, having climbed an extreme elevation during the prevalence of the waters. The four cardinal points are so many demigods, of whom the West, called Kabeun, has priority of age. The East, North, and South, are deemed to be his sons, by a maid, who incautiously exposed herself in bathing to the west wind. Iagoo is the god of the marvellous, and many most extravagant tales, of forest and domestic adventure, are heaped upon him. Kwasind is a sort of Samson, who threw a huge mass of rock, such as the Cyclops cast at Mentor. Weeng is the god of sleep, who is represented to have numerous small emissaries at his service, reminding us of Pope's creation of Gnomes, who climb up upon the forehead, and wielding a tiny club, knock individuals to sleep. Panguk is death, in his symbolic attitude. He is armed with a bow and arrows. It would be easy to extend this enumeration.

The mental powers of the Indian, constitutes a topic which we do not design to discuss. But it must be manifest, that some of their peculiarities are brought out by their system of mythology and spirit-craft. War, public policy, hunting, abstinence, endurance, and courageous adventure, form the leading topics of their mental efforts in speaking. These are deemed the appropriate themes of men, sages, and warriors. But their intellectual essays have also a domestic theatre of exhibition. It is here that the Indian mind unbends itself, and reveals some of its less obvious traits. Their public speakers cultivate a particular branch of oratory. They are careful in the use of words, and are regarded as standards of purity in the language. They appear to have

an accurate ear for the rhythm of a sentence, and delight in rounding off a period, for which the language affords great facilities, by its long and stately words, and its multiform inflections. A drift of thought, an elevation of style, is observable in their public speaking, which is dropt in private conversation. Voice, attitude, and motion, are deemed of the highest consequence. Much of the meaning of their expressions is varied by the vehement, subdued, or prolonged tone, in which they are uttered. In private conversation, on the contrary, all is altered. There is an equanimity of tone, and careless, easy vein of narration, or dialogue, in which the power of memory is most strikingly brought out. The very voice and words of the supposed speaker are assumed. Fear, supplication, timidity, or boasting, are exactly depicted; and the deepest interest, or merriment, are excited. All is ease and freedom from restraint. There is nothing of the coldness, or severe formality of the council. The pipe is put to its ordinary use, and all its symbolic sanctity is laid aside with the wampum belt, and the often reiterated state epithets, "Nosa" and "Kosinan."

Those of the aboriginal race who excel in private conversation, become, to their tribes, oral chronicles, and are relied on for traditions as well as tales. It is necessary, in listening to them, to distinguish between the gossip and the historian—the narrator of real events, and of nursery tales. For they gather together every thing, from the fabulous feats of Manébozho and Misshozha, to the hair-breadth escapes of Pontiac, or the Black Hawk. They are generally men of a good memory, and a certain degree of humour, who have experienced vicissitudes, and are cast into the vale of years. In the rehearsal of their tales, transformations are a part of the machinery relied on; and some of them are as accurately adapted to the purposes of amusement or instruction, as if Ovid himself had been consulted in their composition. Many objects in the inanimate creation, according to these tales, were originally men and women; and numerous animals had other forms, in the first stages of existence, which they, as well as human beings, forfeited, rather by the power of necromancy, than of transmigration. The evening star, it is fabled, was formerly a woman. An ambitious boy became one of the planets. Three brothers, travelling in a canoe, were translated into a group of stars. The fox, lynx, hare, robin, eagle, and numerous other

species, retain places in Indian astronomy. The mouse obtained celestial elevation by creeping up the rainbow, which story makes a flossy mass of bright threads, and by the power of gnawing, relieved a captive in the sky. It is a coincidence, which we note, that *Ursa Major*, is called by them, the bear.

The earth, also, is a fruitful theatre of transformations. The wolf was formerly a boy, who was neglected by his parents. A shell, lying on the shore, was transformed into the racoon. The present name of this animal, *Aisebun*, signifies he was a shell, being the noun singular, with the inflection for the past tense. The brains of an adulteress were converted into the addikumaig, or white fish. The power of transformation was variously exercised. It most commonly existed in magicians, of whom Mishósha retains much celebrity in story, as the magician of the lakes. He possessed a magic canoe, which would rush forward through the water, on the utterance of a charm, with a speed that would outstrip even Capt. Haldimand, in his miraculous canoe journey, detailed in "Wacousta." Hundreds of miles were performed in as many minutes. The charm which he uttered, consisted of a monosyllable containing one consonant, which does not belong to the language; and this word has no definite meaning. So that the language of magic and demonology, has one feature in common in all ages, and with every nation.

The intellectual creations of the Indians, admit of the agency of giants and fairies. Anak and his progeny could not have created more alarm in the minds of the ten faithless spies, than do the race of fabulous Weendigos to the Indian tribes. These giants are represented as cannibals, who ate up men, women, and children. Indian fairies are of two classes, distinguished as the place of their revels is either the land or water. Land fairies are imagined to choose their residence about promontories, water-falls, and solemn groves. The water, besides its appropriate class of aquatic fairies, is supposed to be the residence of a race of beings called Nibanába, which have their analogy, except as to sex, in the mermaid. The Indian word indicates a male. Ghosts are the ordinary machinery in their tales of terror and mystery. There is a glimmering of the idea of retributive justice, in the belief that ghosts are capable of existing in fire.

Efforts to better the condition of the Indians, are coeval in date with the settlement of the country. The Albig Society, a programme of whose organization, at a remote point, is prefixed to this article, appears to have mainly the design of a society of inquiry for collecting and preserving facts in the moral and intellectual history of the Indian tribes, having a particular bearing on missionary labour. As such, it seems to have an appropriate field of labour, without treading, particularly, on the grounds of any previous institution. It is religico-literary in its character, and differs, in this respect, from the Inquiry Societies at Andover and Princeton, which are directed exclusively to the attainment of recent missionary intelligence and data.

We approve, most fully, of the objects set forth in its constitution, and should rejoice to see the day, when not a few benevolent individuals and churches only, but the whole American people, should lend their efforts to introduce both information and reformation among our Indian brethren. As an instance of the spirit which accompanies its incipient proceedings, we notice, that the Rev. Messrs. Butler and Worcester were elected honorary members during their confinement in the "Georgia Penitentiary." Although we doubt the abstract propriety, on gospel grounds, of the resistance of these eminent missionaries to the laws of Georgia, yet knowing the motive, and appreciating the firmness of their conduct, we have ever hailed it as an evidence of Christian independence boding good to the Indian churches, and we cherish the voice of approval from a distant frontier. We think the duty of the Christian community to the aboriginal race, is rendered more imperative, as their trials, temporal and spiritual, multiply. We think these trials are the harbingers of eventual good. But there is danger that the friendly voice be misinterpreted, more particularly in the present interesting era of the missionary enterprise, when the field of foreign labours is irradiated with the bow of promise, while dark and gloomy clouds seem, to human view, to be gathering over the prospects of the Indians. We may resume this subject in the sequel.

One of the prominent means of benefitting the great mass of the Indian population, is translation. We are of the number of those who think that our Indian languages have been unjustly decried, although they have also, in some respects, been over-rated. Peculiarly adapted, as they are, to the

wants of Indian life, they appear capable of almost unlimited application and extension. To a vocabulary, simple in its roots, they supply a set of principles, which enable the speaker, by the formation of derivatives and compounds, to multiply and re-multiply words and expressions, in a manner, of which the English language gives not the slightest conception. Not only the subject-noun, but its qualities, its position, its pronouns, nominative and objective, and the action, of which it is the active, passive, or reflective object, are all indicated in a single expression. This concrete character of the language, fills its words with meaning, requiring often an entire sentence for its explanation. The objection to this process of word-making is, that the expressions are inconveniently long—a difficulty not felt by the Indians in its oral use, but which appears very striking when it comes to be written, and written as it usually is, without accents to guide in the pronunciation, and without any uniform system of orthography.

The language seems to be particularly full of resources, when it is applied to the phenomena of nature. The heavens and the earth, as visibly displayed, appear to constitute to the Indian mind, a volume which even a child may read. All that relates to light and shade, to colour and quality, to purity or impurity, to fluid or solid, to matter or spirit, seems to be woven into the texture of the language with silken threads. Light and sound, taste and feeling, hearing and smelling, are exercises of the senses, rivited in words to the objects acting or acted on. To love and to hate, to see and to burn, are words never employed disjunctively, but constantly reveal, by their affixes or suffixes, the object loved or loving, seen or seeing, hated or hating, burned or burning. One expulse of the breath, indicates both quality and position. Red or blue cloud, deep or shallow water, up or down the stream, on or in the earth, by or in the tree, in the canoe, on the canoe, behind the canoe, before the canoe, under the canoe, or above the canoe, are simple compounds. All its inanimate substantives are varied to assume vital forms, and are thus transferred to the class of living beings. Indeed, the primary increment of all their verbs, appears to be a dyssyllable, which denotes life, or essence of life. *Iah*, indicates being, or to be, and is to be traced by one of its syllables, through every active verb. Such a language

seems peculiarly adapted to the purposes of religion. Its double pronominal plural, including or excluding the object addressed, gives it an appropriate term of supplication to the Supreme Being. And we incline to believe, that he who has ever understandingly heard a converted Indian pray, will scarcely need to consult a philological disquisition to determine the applicability of the language to the active uses of Christianity. The following is the first verse of Genesis:

<i>Wiashkud</i>	<i>Gezhá</i>	<i>Monedó</i>	<i>goé</i>	<i>ozheton</i>	<i>geezhig</i>	<i>giá</i>	<i>akkeé</i>
Permutative form of the adverb 'first,' with the inanimate termination 'uk,' to correspond with the verb.	Generous, Good, Merciful, from 'Gezhawadizi,' adjective animate—'he,' benevolent, and naturally kind, as a father to children, &c.	Spirit.	'He,' with the termination for past tense indicating 'did.'	Third person singular of the verb 'To Move,' with inanimate termination 'in,' 'on.'	Sky—Firmament—Heaven, 'beginning' is sometimes substituted for this word. It is, however, only the 'local' form for 'above.'	and	Earth.

But we have not space to pursue this subject. We will merely add, that unlike most modern languages, the Indian dialects are perfectly homogenous in their materials, and strictly systematic in their principles. The tone of conversation and dialogue appears to be more elevated, than among analagous classes of words in civilized life. The diction is simple and pure, and hence the common addresses of their speakers, when literally translated, are admired. Exalted and disinterested sentiment is often unfolded with a happy perspicuity, in their sententious polysyllables. And the mind is led to wonder, in the philosophy of its syntax, where a people so literally "peeled and scattered," should have derived, not the language itself, but the principles by which it is governed.

The first translations of portions of the Scriptures into the Indian languages, date nearly as far back as the planting of the colonies. The efforts of Roger Williams, and the translation of the entire Bible into the Natic, by Elliot, are now, however, regarded as mere literary materials. The earliest attempts of this kind of modern date, which have come to our knowledge, are those of the Moravian Brethren. The translations of Zeisberger into the Delaware are evi-

dences of his research and piety; and his comprehensive history of Christ must be a work of inestimable value to the western remnant of that tribe. We are not aware that Mr. Heckewelder, who wrote copiously on the language, translated any of the Scriptures. Dencke's three epistles of John are, we understand, in use by portions of the western Delawares. Brandt's Gospel of John, in the Mohawk, has, we think, been suppressed, within late years, by the American Bible Society. The introduction of the Greek word "logos," and some other foreign idioms, were not deemed admissible in a translation intended to be read by a people whose knowledge was confined almost exclusively to the vocabulary of the Mohawk.

An error, analagous in one respect, has been committed in the anonymous translation of the New Testament into to the Chippewa, or rather Otto-Chippewa, recently (1833) published at Albany. The word "baptise," introduced from its Greek root, with Indian inflections for tense, and Indian pronouns prefixed and suffixed, must create, in the Indian mind, the sensations of a jargon, when contrasted with their appropriate vernacular terms for this rite. Other objections have been suggested to this translation; but as we do not intend to offer a detailed *critique* on it, they will be omitted. One remark we deem, however, of sufficient importance to state. It is the frequent violation of gender, and the careless application of words, which by the natives, are appropriately restricted to the brute, or human creation. Thus, in Matthew i. 23, the compound term "tahsunjeko," applied to the virgin, is usually restricted to animals, and coincides, more nearly with the sense of being with fold. Onijânissi would be the appropriate word. The general term, "oskinegequa," a young woman, used in the same verse, is not distinctive, as the language has another (keekong) descriptive of a virgin. The dialect in which this version is written, approaches nearer the Ottawa than the Chippewa, containing many words which are peculiar to the former, and being characterised throughout by the consonants *p* and *t*, in words wherein the latter employ *b* and *d*, and also by the harsh inflection "*ink*," instead of *ing*. The adverb "*dush*," is employed as a suffix to proper names, in which it has the same relative character of aggregation, as if the word *then* were incorporated with the words John or Peter. We understand the thought-work of this translation is originally due to the

captive John Tanner, who was taken, when a boy, by the Ottowas; but the chirography and arduous literary labour in revising and retouching, are by a medical gentleman, late of the army, who has published valuable observations in other departments of research.

There is one feature, which is equally open to critical censure, in all the Scripture translations into the Indian tongues, which have been attempted in this country. None of them appear to have been made from the original Hebrew or Greek text. Most of these essays are based on English or German versions, in which the idiomatic phrases are less at one with the original. Neither is there given a system of alphabetical notation which may serve as a guide to the powers of the Indian vowels, and also in tracing the degree of fidelity which has been observed in adhering to these standards. To write the Indian as we would write the English, is to have some three or four different sounds for each vowel, and for each diphthong; besides an ample range in the alterative powers of the consonants. All these come to be accurately understood by the school-boy, from constant use and repetition. But when the eye falls upon an *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, or *u*, in the Indian, the query arises, which of the *English* sounds of the vowels are designed to be conveyed, and what rule shall the tongue resort to, in emitting the profusion of consonants usually accompanying them. We hope the time has arrived when this question will be met. All the mission Boards are equally interested in it. The missionaries of most of them have done something in the way of preparing primary books for the Indian schools. And each one appears to have followed a method, in some respects peculiar. Our table is crowded with primer-like pamphlets of this character, in the orthography of which, it may be observed, there is a singular oscillation between redundancy on one hand, and affected simplicity on the other. Mr. Pickering's system has been adopted in the Sandwich Islands, and has been, to some extent, employed on this continent. Although we cannot fully concur in all his positions, so far as relates to the western tribes, we approve most of them, and think the essay eminently entitled to the notice of the Mission Boards, in fixing on a general system.

Peter Jones' translation of the Gospel of John into the Chippewa, named in our caption, comes to us, with the clear page, square-faced type, and firm white paper of the

London press. We mention these external advantages, as they are to a remarkable degree wanting in the American publications of similar kind. Mr. Jones is, in some respects, the most remarkable personage who has appeared, not only in his particular tribe, but among the Chippewa race. He has not risen, like his kinsmen, Minnowana, or Pontiac, to induce his countrymen to cast away European manufactures, and to lead them up to the cannon's mouth. Nor like a Red Jacket or a Metea, opposed every advance in agriculture, and the transference of portions of untilled land into money annuities. He has risen up like another Obookiah, to unfold the banner of the Cross, and lead his people to become sharers in the great spiritual conquest waged for the redemption of the world. The venerable Skenandoah raised his bony arms in this cause, years ago, but the Oneidas were not prepared to follow him with the zeal that has attended Peter Jones. We have it from verbal authority, that this individual was the first convert to Christianity among the Chippewas in Upper Canada. He was arrested by the truth at a religious assemblage in the open air, near the banks of Lake Ontario. He immediately abandoned the use of ardent spirits, and assumed a character of devoted activity in spreading the revealed truth. His people listened to him with eagerness, and many of them forsook their vices, gave up drinking and Sabbath-breaking, and embraced the doctrine of salvation through a crucified Redeemer: We have now before us a report of two years standing, in which the number of Chippewa converts, and persons under school instruction, is stated at 1570, besides about 500 Mohawks, and other members of the ancient league of the Six Nations.\* We do not mean to infer, that all this change, so far as human agency is concerned, is due to this native missionary. We do not forget the apostolical labours of Elder Case, and his adjuncts, and of John Sunday, and his native brethren. But we regard Peter Jones as the initial conquest, the prop, so to say, on which others stood, and which by being knocked away, let the waters flow freely, and augmented their current.

Translations of the Scriptures from such a man, must come with great respect for the *motive*, and much confidence in the right interpretation of spiritual meanings. We

\*Eleventh Annual Report of the Managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, &c. Philad. 1832.

are informed, this gospel, as well as his previous translation of Matthew, has been extensively circulated among his people. So far as relates to the system of orthography, it falls, in a measure, under the remarks before made; but it observes a strict grammatical concord, is written in a pure dialect, and is more elementary, in the mode of its notation, than any other of the recent Scripture translations, which we have looked into. It avoids the foreign idioms and words, which we adverted to, in alluding to the Albany version of the New Testament, and exhibits no traces of the materialism which, we are told, mark some parts of that laborious performance. The Indian verb, "zegahun," is given as the equivalent for "baptise," as in John i: 25—26. The substantive verb *To Be*, deemed by many philologists to be wanting in the Indian languages of this continent, is freely used by Mr. Jones, in its auxiliary forms, as in John i: 1, 6, 15, &c. We have, in a preceding page, adverted to the existence of this verb in the northern dialects, as affording the probable root of active verbs, and deem it a subject inviting discussion, as bearing on a point early started by theologians—the origin of the American tribes. The verb IAH, spelled "ahyah," in the verses referred to in Mr. Jones' version, having the particle for past tense, "ke," prefixed, or "hun," suffixed, appears to be restricted in its use, to objects possessed of independent vitality, if not of spirituality. For it cannot be applied, in any of its numerous forms, to the existence of mere *passion or feeling*—accidents, which by a peculiarity in the rules of the grammar, are referred to as subordinate *parts* or increments of an *inanimate* character, and not as units, or *whole bodies* of existences. The native speaker cannot therefore say, *I am glad, I am sorry, &c.*; but the literal expressions are, *I glad, I sorry, &c.* This restriction has probably caused philologists to observe, that the verb declarative of existence was wanting, and discouraged them in the search after it. They have naturally concluded that it was *uniformly* absent, because it was so in a large number of expressions. When it becomes necessary for the Indians to denote abstract existence, in the constituent *parts* of the body, or in any *gross or material* object of the creation, the corresponding verb for it is ATTA. And these two verbs preserve an exact parallelism, so far as the pronouns permit. In the conjugation of the verb *Iah*, as in the Latin *sum*, a departure

from the *radex*, may be made by the introduction of *do*, *dow*, *ow*, *eev*, &c., words variously spelt, and supplying much of the verbal texture of Mr. Jones', and other translations.

But we would not divert attention from the great practical end of translation, in the search after critical prerequisites. The great object of missionaries is not to write philological treatises, but to teach the gospel; and to promote this end, minor considerations may be sacrificed. We do not intend to countenance the idea that inaccuracies in any part of the system of primary schools, or Bible translations, should be introduced. We would hold the missionary up to the duty of being a scholar, as well as a Christian. We believe the greatest degree of scientific precision, in elementary instruction, is compatible with the highest efforts in experimental Christianity. The two objects are independent, but not at variance. Attainments in the one may, interchangeably, precede or follow attainments in the other. But we conceive the *spiritual* wants of the tribes to be such, that no means, and *no want of means*, should interpose a bar to their relief. As we have before indicated, we think their claims on the American churches and the American people to be of an imperious character. We cannot fully reconcile it to the principles of national duty, to see the fields of Foreign Missionary labour, so pressed with young men panting for the service of Christ, while our own poor, wandering and comparatively small tribes, are so inadequately supplied.

It is true, we have no millions to be preached to in a single language. Here are no splendid temples of idolatry to be overthrown. Infanticide is not to be arrested in parents, nor widows rescued from the funeral pyre. No car of Juggernaut is driven on the plains of the Missouri or the Arkansas. No offerings are committed on the Mississippi, under the mistaken belief that its waters are sacred. Nor do thousands of zealous devotees wander to a shrine of brick which is supposed to contain a few hairs of Buddha, or Vishnoo. But here, in the bosom of our own territory, exist more than two hundred thousand men, women, and children, each of whom *has a soul to save or lose*. Great numbers of these people speak the same language, and no small portion of them are favourably situated to practise agriculture, grazing and the mechanic arts. Most of them have

annuities to aid in the incipient work of civilization. They are not besotted, like seven-eighths of the caste-ridden population of India, with the idea of a degraded birth. Nobler sentiments of natural liberty never were uttered, than those which are embalmed in the history of their orators and warriors. Their simple arts of magic and manito-worship, are ready to totter with a touch. And there seems nothing but active, united, persevering efforts necessary, to win them over to the side of virtue, and lead them in the paths of eternal truth. We owe them a great moral debt. Our duty as philanthropists, and our duty as Christians coincide. And we fully respond to the sentiment of one of the recent delegates from the Congregational churches of England, that our first and most imperious duty, with respect to heathen nations, is at home. Let the American churches come up to this duty, with a determination to work as well as pray. Grecian fable teaches us, that he who would not put his shoulders to the wheel, called in vain upon Hercules. And shall Christians, who have the lamp of inspired truth to guide them, practise a more lukewarm philosophy?

The gloomy aspect of the Indian question, for several years, may appear to present discouragements to the minds of many. But we doubt whether discouragement is its legitimate effect. The assertion of independent political power by tribes living entirely within the bounds of chartered States, was made at a time most unpropitious for its admission. Whatever may have been the original and just right of the Indians to both soil and sovereignty—and here we think there can be no dispute—the period for successfully asserting and maintaining it, was manifestly anterior to the establishment of our present federative system. Those Indian politicians who have been most able in defending their rights, would, with the same power of advocacy, half a century ago, have procured a successful decision on it. But it was then tacitly waived, and like all rights once waived, the reassertion of them is attended with insuperable difficulties. It was to have been anticipated that the enjoyment of peace, and their advance in civilization, would lead the southern Indians to bring up the question. Circumstances had been preparing their minds for it during several years. Its active discussion, during the last ten or fifteen years, is the natural result of the growing population of the States, on the one hand, and the growing intelligence of the Indians,

on the other. Apart from all bearing the question *may have*, or *may have had*, on temporary politics, we think its discussion and settlement was desirable, both in a religious and political point of view. Politics was interested to know whether there could be any incremental portions of the community possessing powers paramount to the entire sum of the increments. Christianity was interested in the consideration of several axioms of duty. Was the Christian injunction, "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," and again the directions, "when they persecute you in one city, flee to another," to be construed into general maxims of non-resistance to political power, *ab initio*. There was still a weightier question. It was the reasonable doubt, extensively felt, whether these Indian communities, living in the midst of other communities without being incorporated with them, could ever become *extensively* and *permanently* civilized and evangelized. It was not doubted, that there were portions of the impinged tribes well instructed, and comparatively opulent and happy. There were schools and churches established among them, and no small amount of missionary investment made, which, by the transference of tribes to new locations, must be hazarded. But it was also known, that there were large portions of these very communities poor, degraded and intemperate, and that the exaltation of some of the principal chiefs and headmen to be landlords and planters, had had the effect to leave the condition of the commonalty more irretrievably deplorable. And it soon began to be felt, that whatever might be the amount of missionary success, or the abstract rights of the Indians, the cause must depend for its perpetuity in Indian life and institutions, to the removal of the tribes to positions where they could freely exercise the sovereignty they claimed, and were entitled, and aspired to.

We have occasion to know, that these considerations were felt by some of the sincerest friends of the Indian cause, and that they were, at the same time, regarded as governing principles by our most enlightened statesmen, who deplored a political necessity, which seemed to place it beyond their power to exert themselves successfully for the Indians while they occupied their locations east of the Mississippi. The question being now virtually terminated, the duty of the Christian community is clear. It is to follow them with the oil and balm of the word, wherever they go, and fearlessly

to perform the good Samaritan's part. We should emulate the zeal and perseverance of Paul, and the eloquence of Apollo. There is much encouragement to press forward. The tribes are emancipated from political thralldom. They possess, to a considerable extent, herds and flocks, and horses, and an ample domain. And although

"——no sunny fountains  
Roll down their golden sands,"

recent and authentic statements represent them to be in the possession of an exuberant soil, and a genial and healthy climate, which, by moderate exertions, will yield them both comfort and opulence.

We respect the feelings of those portions of the southern tribes, who still remain east of the Mississippi. We fully admit and lament the injustice of their fate. We have, not in a single instance only, paused to admire the manly, correct, and eloquent sentiments which they have put forth in various ways. Their struggle has excited, and still continues to excite, deep feelings of sympathy in the church. Sound heads and warm hearts have been active in their cause. The records of these churches indicate the success and faithfulness of missionary labours among them. It has been recently announced that, of the Cherokee, Chickasaw, and Choctaw nations, not less than one thousand evangelical converts to Christianity, have been recognized since the period of the conversion of Catherine Brown.\* We are unadvised of the policy intended to be pursued by the unexpatriated portion of the tribes, but we incline strongly to the opinion, that their best interests, spiritual and temporal, indicate the expediency of their reuniting with their western brethren.

With respect to the tribes occupying more northern latitudes on the frontiers, to whose mythology, superstitions and languages, we have more fully adverted, in the preceding parts of this article, we have but a single remark to add. We think the present era of our public policy, appeals strongly in their behalf. Brought, by the recent legislation of Congress,† to experience, in a great measure, the effects of a legal severity of guardianship, induced wholly by the

\* See St. Louis Observer, Vol. 1, No. 46.

† Document No. 474, House of Representatives, 23d Congress, 1st session, p. 131. With a map.

belligerent attitude of the southern tribes, they have neither the same pecuniary means to sustain themselves, nor the same degree of benevolent sympathy enlisted in their favour. All the tribes who occupied the area of Ohio and Indiana, (the Miamies excepted,) have made such arrangements with the government as eventually *will*, and, in a great measure, already *has*, transferred them to positions more southerly in latitude, and more favourable to their increase, west of the Mississippi. The Pottowattomies of Illinois will, by a late treaty, expatriate themselves to a favourable location between the Mississippi and Missouri, in the same latitudes they now occupy. This will leave the Menomonees, Ottowas and Chippewas, as the occupants of the remaining angle of the Union, east of the Mississippi, and not within the limits of any chartered State. The area thus occupied is extensive. It is intersected by the great chain of Lakes, and their intercommunications with the upper Mississippi. Extensive portions of it, particularly the peninsula of Michigan, and the territorial region of Green Bay, are of a valuable agricultural character. And in proportion as the more northerly parts embrace unprofitable tracts, their fishing and commercial privileges are enhanced. The tribes who are thus located, are placed measurably beyond the causes of migratory disturbance, and being on the line of open communication with the northern and middle States, seem circumstanced at a future, and not distant period, to present peculiar claims on the benevolent resources and enterprise of these portions of the Union.

## ART. VI. ELEMENTS OF MENTAL DISCIPLINE.\*

By Rev. Thomas H. Skinner, D. D., Professor at Andover.

STUDIOUS and pious habits have, by some persons, been thought unfriendly to each other; hence there have been men of piety who renounced learning, as well as men of learning who neglected piety; and thus have arisen two of the most fruitful sources of evil to mankind, (I know not which is worse,) ignorant religion, and irreligious knowledge.

As in other cases, mutual repugnance here, has sprung, at least to some extent, from mutual misunderstanding. Pious men have sometimes identified learning with what the Scriptures have reprobated under the name of the wisdom of this world; and men devoted to learning have sometimes strangely misconceived of religion, as almost the same thing with contempt of intellectual excellence.

The former mistake (I omit now the consideration of the latter) is not difficult to be explained. Learning as generally cultivated and used, and as treasured in books, bears the image and superscription of the unsanctified world, and indeed is that world's chief strong-hold and champion: such learning is destined to come to nought. Except to resist and countervail its tendencies, the simple spirit of piety can choose to have but little to do with it: and on the supposition that all learning must be such—a mistake which it is not surprising some pious men have fallen into—entire non-intercourse with learning, except if possible to abolish it, would not be undesirable or unwise. But learning need not bear the world's stamp, or be pervaded with the world's spirit. Piety may dwell with it, may enjoy and use it, as lawfully as wealth, or honour, or any of the good things of this life. Indeed, piety and learning have a peculiar affinity for each other; the association of them is natural, and ought, if possible, to be invariable. All their elements and tendencies harmonize perfectly; and, if combined, would increase each other's efficiency: Piety would exalt and illuminate learn-

[\* This article was delivered as an Introductory Lecture at the opening the present academic year in the Theological Seminary, Andover. The author has kindly consented to its publication here, at the particular request of the Editor and of many who heard it. It is thought best to retain its original form of a Lecture unaltered.—EDITOR.]

ing, and learning would contribute to the dignity, the strength and the enlargement of piety: they ought always, therefore, as far as possible, to dwell and live, with and in each other; each loving and cherishing the other as itself.

No assertion carries with it higher evidence of its truth than this. Learning is the delight of man's rational nature; it is indeed our reason's natural spouse; and never is the sacred volume more falsified and perverted than when adduced as a witness against it. Is that book an enemy to learning which demands the highest measures of learning in order to its being well expounded or thoroughly understood? Is it an enemy to itself? Why, if the Bible be against learning, does it inculcate a religion which is light, and in which there is no darkness at all? Why does it style the disciples of that religion children of light? Why does it allure us to Him who is its great theme and charm, by informing us that in Him dwell all the treasures of knowledge? Why does it bestow such elegant, such high wrought encomiums on learning and understanding, as are not to be found in all writings beside, of ancient and modern times? Why does it transport us with visions of heaven, as of a world of perfect knowledge? The Bible against learning! what else comparatively is in favour of it?

The church, on this point, has been under no mistake. The outcry against learning, which, in almost every age, has to some extent been raised within her borders, was not her own voice, but that of frenzied fanatics, or unlettered bigots, in membership indeed, but, in this respect, not in fellow-feeling with her. What friend has learning ever had, as constant, as faithful, as munificent, as efficient, as the church? What testimony has she given in behalf of learning by her standing demand for it in the ministry? Her first ministers, heaven-taught, had the various languages of men as perfectly at their command, as their own vernacular tongue: and what in them was the product of miracle, she has required to be as perfectly as possible supplied in their successors by thorough education. This, at least generally, has been, and is the fact. The church has demanded learning in her ministers; she has encouraged it in all her members; she has expended treasure and life in maintaining it, both within and without her pale; and she has at this moment thousands of devoted, enterprizing, and indefatigable labourers, night and day, employed in its service.

The existence, gentlemen, of this institution, is one among many proofs, that the portion of the church with which we are particularly connected, can give their approbation to none but a learned ministry: and your attendance here is proof, that deeming yourselves called of God to the work of the ministry, you have settled it in your minds that as learning is no longer to be acquired by miracle, you are also called of God to go through a preliminary course of theological study. The point is decided. However strong and ardent may be your desire to be even now engaged in the business of saving men, and whatever temptations, labours, expenses, difficulties, may be incidental to a complete course of preparatory discipline, you have begun, and before you enter the sacred office, you will have finished such a course. You cannot but see from what has been said, that, assuming the correctness of your judgement as to the employment you are designed for, in future life, I regard this determination on your part, as duteous and coincident with the will of God concerning you. I shall not surprise you then by saying, that it gives me more pleasure to meet you in this sequestered place, pursuing the slow and it may be tedious process of mental discipline, observing fixed and severe rules of study, giving your thoughts to (abstract principles,) patiently exploring and comparing different doctrines and philosophies, and going from day to day the same unvaried round of intellectual application; than I could have in seeing you already engaged in the labours of the ministry with whatever zeal or popularity. I meet you, as I suppose, at the post of duty, where there may be more self-denial, but where certainly there is more safety, more honour, and more usefulness, on the whole, than any where else. As one appointed to take part in the business of assisting you through the present, in one view, the most important period of your earthly existence, I shall doubtless be expected on this occasion, to make my remarks of a tenour strictly congenial with that of your appropriate pursuits here, that is, in some respect instructive to you, as devoted theological students, endeavouring by every means in your power to acquire the mental discipline and furniture requisite to your regular entrance on the great work before you. This, I admit to be incumbent upon me. I address you then as a company of strict and severe students, pursuing for the highest and most sacred of all purposes, intellectual improvement: and I shall

aim exclusively in all my remarks, to promote your success in this pursuit. My specific object is to make the way to success plain.

The beginning, the summit of wisdom in conducting this pursuit, as well as every other in which our faculties can be employed, is, without question, putting them under the influence of the fear of the Lord—subjecting ourselves absolutely to the command of a holy will and purpose—making all our studies and intellectual exertions instances of a strictly spiritual and religious manner of life. He who in a course of study maintains the closest walk with God, takes the best way to make study available to its immediate purposes. He is more likely to excel in mental improvement, in strength and vigour of understanding, in ability to think, investigate, and instruct, in learning and all intellectual treasures and resources; than if he should allow the desire of intellectual pre-eminence, or the love of learning, to domineer within him, altogether unregulated, unrestrained, unmeddled with, by any religious principle or feeling. Will it be questioned, that nothing is so well suited to draw out all the powers of the mind into their most perfect operation, as to bring it into intercourse with Him who is the source and centre of all minds? His presence alone, felt and enjoyed, will more quicken, and illuminate, and enlarge the mind of man, than all other influences beside. Why should it not? It rouses and stimulates all that is spiritual or intellectual within us, to be consciously in the presence of a man of great intellectual excellence: must not he then who, by the sense-surmounting power of faith, dwells in the secret place of the Most High, have of all men, other things being equal, incomparably the purest, richest, mightiest mental life? A consciousness of the *presence* of the Supreme Mind—what intellectual alertness, what stirring of the mental fires, what proclivity to thought, what capacity of great and just conceptions, what security against partial, low, uncomprehensive views, must not that feeling imply! Along with supreme intelligence too, supreme goodness is associated, and the feeling of the one as present, includes necessarily the feeling of the presence of the other. What were that person's advantages for mental improvement, who should have the constant companionship of a fellow-man, first among mankind, not only in genius and knowledge, but in moral worth also! What then must be his intellectual advantages who daily and closely walks with God!

It can hardly be questioned by any one of my present hearers, that it is practicable to have such access of mind to the mind of the Infinite Spirit. What else but such access is living piety? It is the thing itself. Piety is but an empty name, if it be not the access of man's mind and spirit, to the mind and spirit of his omnipresent Maker.

Nor do I suppose that any one here can doubt the practicability of maintaining a constant and ever-deepening sense of the presence and fellowship of God, in a course of severe study. It is, indeed, impossible to be *directly* communing with God, while giving the mind wholly to study. The human mind can give itself directly to but one thing at once: this, however, is true in respect to all other as well as intellectual occupations. But it is possible to conduct other pursuits with more or less of spiritual feeling. They may be conducted by men presumed, on the whole, to be pious, with almost no recognition during the day of the Divine Providence or existence; or, notwithstanding the law of finite mind, which forbids its attending perfectly to more than one thing at once, they may be engaged in with a heart so filled with the Spirit of God, as to have every instant a heavenward aspiration, and to be, in a manner, in a perpetual intercourse with heaven; insomuch that it may be said with strict truth, that every thing is done, even eating and drinking, to the glory of God, and in the name of Christ. Thus may men practise agriculture, or any manual occupation; and why may not the deepest and intensest studies be prosecuted in the same manner? Why may not men be exploring the causes and relations of things, conversing with truth in its purest and brightest forms, enriching their hearts and understandings with the choicest treasures of wisdom and learning, and be doing this in the very frame of spirit, in which one should wish to die, or to stand before the last judgement seat—doing it in the fear of God, and with instant prayer for his blessing and assistance? It is a strange, however frequent mistake, to think that there is any incongruity between the severest mental application, and the highest degrees of spiritual mindedness. There is, indeed, danger that high intellectual pursuits, uncontroulled by pious feelings, may lead to every species of irreligious indifference and misbelief; but there is no necessity that such pursuits should be so uncontroulled. There are no pursuits in which men can engage, more congenial with the spirit of piety. Think-

ing, studying, reflecting,—what so directly tends to intercommunion between the mind, and its infinite Author? Plainly, there ought to be no studying, no thinking, unassociated with thoughts of God, and acknowledged dependence on him. It has been with perfect justness observed, that the thought of God, to a serious mind, might be expected to come second to almost every thought. It is, indeed, wonderful that the contrary sentiment should have ever been avowed. That those who have the charge of business, of government, of domestic affairs, should be supposed to have temptations to unspiritual habits, is not surprising; but that students, men devoted to the search of truth as their only calling, and above all, that Theological Students should complain of such temptations, is as if a man should undertake to excuse his neglect of a duty, by pleading the multitude of the inducements and facilities which he had for performing it. From no members of the church should as high measures of personal holiness be expected, as from her ministers, and those who are preparing for the ministry. No places under heaven should be so distinguished for spiritual living, as the seats of our Theological Schools. You may, gentlemen, sink very low in pious feeling, while pursuing your preparatory studies in this Institution; you may become remiss in devout meditation, and in private prayer; you may indulge worldly feeling, and fix your heart on the honour which cometh from man; you may be inflated with ambition; you may dwell in spiritual darkness, and have almost no symptom of the Divine life left within you. Or, on the other hand, you may rise to an unusual height of sympathy and intercourse with heaven; you may make your studies a link for communion with the spirits of the blessed, in their rapt meditations; you may read, and write, and reflect, and meet your instructors, and one another, and take your recreations, and return to your books, and be doing all to the glory of God, and under the light of his countenance. I will not mention all the reasons why you should choose the latter course; let me but repeat by way of recommending it, that it is at the same time the road to the highest possible success in study, and that which, of all other courses, best agrees with the just tendencies and demands of a studious life.

It may now be thought, perhaps, that enough has been said to our purpose;—that if regard be not paid to the

counsel which has been given, little may be expected from the prescription, or the observance of any other counsel ; and that if the course recommended be followed, no further directions will be necessary. However just the former conclusion may be, the latter can by no means be admitted. A mind unsullied by evil might still need instruction, in order to be able to see every path of wisdom and truth it should pursue: much more then, any human mind, at best pure but in part, however elevated and fixed in holy feeling and resolution. Could you rise at once above every disadvantage of your present imperfect state ; could you from this moment transcend in purity of heart, the greatest of all the saints, you would have the docility of a little child, and be conscious, also, of more than a little child's necessities and dependence. Holiness, in the highest degree in which it is ever possessed on earth, does not supersede instruction as to what is wise and prudent in particular practice ; it only gives aptitude to seek for, and appreciate, and follow good instruction. Hence while study should be begun and prosecuted in intercourse with God, he does not truly maintain that intercourse, but is an instance of deplorable self-conceit, who, on account of fancied illumination from heaven, thinks himself above the need of all teaching as to the particular principles and rules best to be observed in pursuing a course of study.

As hope is the spring of endeavour, a student should keep himself, amidst all his intellectual toils, under the impression of the most animating fact, that the human mind, in every power, is illimitably improveable. To the loftiest height of intelligence ever attained by man, the ascent was from an embryo state of intellectual life. Nor was that ascent the bare result of necessity, or of any thing in the nature of mind, or of peculiarity in the structure of a particular mind. It can now be hardly questioned that the best human mind ever created, if shut out from the first from all external influences, would be, at even the remotest period of its existence, scarcely cognizable as a mind : nor would it be in a less undesirable condition, though not so immured, provided all fit care and culture should be withheld from it. The life of the mind, like that of the body, depends for its growth, on its receiving appropriate nourishment and attention. It must at first be duly cared for and fostered by others ; afterwards by both others and itself ; and then by itself at least, perpetually, in order to reach and retain its just

stature and strength. It needs culture; but there is the highest encouragement to bestow culture upon it, in its wonderful improveability. There is almost no point of improvement, which any sound human mind should despair to reach. The original peculiarities of different minds are undoubtedly great, and they are, usually, proportionally great in developement, if not suppressed through neglect or unhappy discipline; but it will scarcely, on reflection, seem extravagant to say, that no one has attained higher intellectual eminence, on the whole, than might be attained by any sound minded man, provided health and life should not prematurely fail; and if, from the early buddings of intellect, suitable methods of application and training should be employed, with due diligence and perseverance. Without, however, what might be thought going to extremes on this subject, one who has given himself to the cultivation of his mind, may find limitless scope for his hopes of intellectual increase. He may, and he should, while pursuing his exhausting labours, enliven his spirit with thoughts like these: "Mind, the brightest thing in existence, is that which is the most susceptible of advancement. My Maker, that he might see in me his own image, gave me a mind; and by his grace I have been taught its value, and inclined to prefer the care and education of it, before all the delights of sense. Moved by His spirit, I cry after knowledge, and lift up my voice for understanding; I seek for her as silver, and search for her as hid treasure: and I shall gain, if I faint not, the object of my desires; I shall find myself in possession of a better and still better mind; I shall be constantly acquiring a more and more perfect use of my powers; I shall be increasing continually in my ability to think, to analyze, to reason, to discourse: my thoughts will be becoming more and more just; my views be enlarging; my knowledge growing; my mind, in all respects, rising, expanding, strengthening, stretching forwards and upwards toward the perfection of mental being: let me but persevere in my disciplinary course, and nothing can intercept the glorious result. Not more irresistibly does the rising sun advance on his way, than my mind will continue to improve under the faithful use of proper means of cultivation." There need be no check certainly to this thrilling anticipation of intellectual advancement, except, at most, in regard to that short twilight season of superannuation, through which a few of mankind pass

near the close of life: nor is it certain that even this exception should be made, as it is not, perhaps, evident that senile dotage might not, in every instance, be avoided, by judicious discipline, seasonably commenced and never discontinued.

But while the unbounded improveableness of the mind should constantly inspirit him who is climbing the steep ascent to intellectual excellence, he should keep clearly in view, *what it is* whose improvement he seeks. This is not mind in distinction only from organized body; nor the *human* mind, in mere distinction from mind of other orders; but *the whole human mind*, and not exclusively one or more of its attributes. The just discipline of the mind, is the discipline, in due measure, of all its powers. Where some of these are cultivated to the neglect of others, the result is intellectual disproportion and general imbecility. Nor is it probable that the favourite faculties themselves will be as well developed and improved, as they would have been, under no more than a due share of attention. Let analogy here instruct us. The general health of the body is necessary to the vigorous and full growth of any part; so that if by excessively educating one member, we impair the vital energy of the system, we injure the object of our partiality more perhaps, than perfect neglect would have done; and thus, doubtless, a partial discipline of the mind has often defeated its own purpose. A youthful student, on a very hasty examination of his peculiar mental structure, perhaps without any examination, thinks that nature designed him for a mathematician or a poet, and determines to nurse, with the utmost assiduity, the particular power which, by destination, is to make him illustrious. Henceforward he remits attention to every study which is not in his own view directly adapted to increase his reasoning, or his inventive faculty. The consequence is, the total failure of his unadvised plan. He becomes distinguished for nothing, or nothing but vanity and weakness. Such, more frequently perhaps than is commonly supposed, is the direct result of disproportioned mental discipline. And is it not what the known nature of the human mind should lead us to expect from the course pursued? Are not the several faculties of the mind, integrant, composing, and constituting one whole; so that one part being absent or defectively developed, the whole is necessarily disordered, and like a machine in a similar condition, incapable of equal and efficient move-

ment? Nay, to speak with perfect truth, are the mental faculties aught but the simple essential mind itself, regarded in relation to its several states and functions? and, if so, is not the neglect of any one faculty, the neglect of the substance mind? and should not the mind be expected to suffer from such neglect? and if it do suffer, will not the injury appear in every mental operation and development? I cannot but think that failure in intellectual education, is to a great extent referable to the cause I am considering. There are comparatively but few human minds to which the power of education is to any considerable extent applied; but how much fewer to which it is applied with the assiduity which the high excellence and destination of the human mind demand? And even where it is applied with the greatest diligence, how often is that diligence used without so much as a distinct aim, to discipline all the mind's energies in equal degree, and draw them out into symmetrical developements? Some examples there are of what man may become by judicious education, and they are the admiration of the world. Had such education, every human being's natural right, been general, to what rank in intelligence would not the race have attained. We wonder at the small results of education, but we should rather wonder that the results are so great considering the extreme want of pains and discretion, in conducting the business of education itself.

I have not intended, by any thing which has been said, to recommend a course of discipline which should disregard original diversity in different mental constitutions, or the mental peculiarity of each individual. A symmetrical intellectual development does not demand such a discipline. On the contrary, no discipline which does not accommodate its appliances to what is peculiar in each mind's make and temperament, is at all suited to produce a well proportioned or a full intellectual maturity. And I submit this remark as one of prime importance, and deserving a place among first principles, in the science of mental culture. To frame one discipline for every mind, is not less absurd than to prescribe one medicine for every disease, or one dietetic regimen to every person. Some minds are originally gifted with one faculty in large, and another in small dimensions: some are surprisingly precocious, and others very late in development: some are quick and others slow in movement: some phlegmatic, and others mercurial in constitutional temper. It is

easy to see what must be the result, when minds thus variously constituted are subjected to precisely the same training. Not one of them may attain to its just stature; not one be of full dimensions or well proportioned: many may be perverted and many spoiled; while by discretion in training all might have become specimens of mental excellence—ornaments, more or less brilliant, to human nature. It is manifest, what scope now presents itself for the exercise of censure upon prevailing practice in the discipline of mind, especially the minds of the young; but I forbear: I cannot, however, suppress the remark, that nothing appears to be of deeper concern to teachers—those who by profession are cultivators of mind—than the most careful attention on their part, to the native as well as the acquired faculties of those particular minds that Providence commits into their hands, to be trained and educated for life and eternity.

There is, however, another observation, more pertinent to my present auditory, which I deem it more important to introduce in this connexion. It is that youth, and especially those young men, who having gone through the primary parts of a liberal education, regard themselves as not wholly incompetent to judge rightly of their own mental peculiarities, may fall into a serious mistake as to this important point. They may mistake in two ways: they may decide justly in respect to their individual idiosyncrases, or peculiarities of mind, yet not take the right course in mental self-training; or they may misjudge in the former respect. How often has it happened, that young men, feeling in themselves the strong and resistless promptings to certain mental applications, have piously and perhaps justly concluded, that they should cherish these promptings as indications of the Divine will respecting what they should do with themselves; but have thenceforward made the indulgence of these high natural propensities, almost the whole of their future education; and thus have weakened all their other powers, and, in a manner already explained, their essential mind itself; and so have defeated their own ardent purpose, and the end of their creation? The tendencies of the mind in one direction, are often an admonition, not so much that these tendencies are not to be neglected, as that certain others are with greater pains to be elicited and strengthened, so that the mind's balance and symmetry may be preserved. It is, indeed, of the highest moment, that the natural apti-

tudes of the mind be favoured, and sedulously cherished in education. The greatest results may depend upon attention to this point. Many a mind has scarcely become conscious of intellectual life, under perhaps quite a considerable course of teaching, until its peculiar bent of nature happened to be fallen in with by disciplinary influence; when at once, new and surprising manifestations of power began to take place. Still nothing were more unwise, than on making such discoveries as this, forthwith to withdraw attention from the mind's other faculties, and make the cultivation of the prominent one, the sole object of concern. That one should certainly have paramount care, but the judicious cultivation of the others may be indispensable to its arriving at its destined size and strength.

I spoke of another mistake sometimes made by youthful minds, namely: a misjudgement as to what their original peculiarities are. They take for these, their unjustifiable inclinations. For the peculiarities of their original mental structure, they make no serious search; but their dislike to severe and protracted study, and their preference of what they think will require less pains, is almost invincible; and from their reluctance to think themselves indolent or irresolute, they gladly take these feelings for a bias of nature, pointing out something else as the proper object of their pursuit, than what demands such laborious and tedious application. I need not mention the ordinary result. The noblest of minds giving itself up to idleness or ease, under whatever temptation, gives itself up also to eventual inefficiency and contempt. No mind is so mighty as to be proof against indolence. Who can tell but that brighter spirits than any now shining in the firmament of fame, have passed away under its influence, unthought of, or despised? How many Newtons may be lying in unknown or ignoble graves, because they mistook temptations to self-indulgence, for natural intimations that they should forego a course of intense mental application.

This remark suggests another fundameptal maxim. Mind, though of all things the most improveable, is so, only by the workings of its own peculiar activity. It cannot advance otherwise, be the impulses on it what they may, than by advancing itself. It can make no progress by yielding itself passively, to any outward influence. It is impossible indeed, to conceive how it can rationally act, that is, as

*mind*, act at all, unless there be somewhat out of itself, its own image at least, objective in respect to it: and it is also most evident, that all the outward objects or circumstances with which it has any intercourse, give it some exercise, and leave on it some impression: and these two facts show how important it is that the most consummate wisdom and virtue be employed, in conducting all the plans and processes of intellectual education. Nevertheless, the mind does not advance, is not moved at all, except as it moves itself; and is not the creature, as fatalists teach, but the lord of its circumstances. If its circumstances have decisive influence on it, one way or the other, it makes them decisive, by its own choice or consent. If consciousness ascertains us of any thing it is this; nor is there a human breast that does not witness against the opposite dogma, as no less a contradiction of universal experience, than of every principle of morality and religion. The mind cannot be in any way injured, neither can it be improved, be its advantages what they may, but by the free exercise of its own activity. To be self-active, is the property of all life. The very definition of life, according to the ancients, and it seems to be a true one, is self-activity. That, and that only, is a living thing which is self-active; a dead thing may be moved, but a living thing is one that can move itself. The mind of man is a living thing; it has the highest kind of life; nay, as far as we know, is all life: it is therefore essential to the human mind to be self-active; and it is not mind, but something which mind, as such, disowns, that one is advanced in, when he advances without mental activity on his own part. But this cannot, I presume, have escaped any one's consideration. Every living thing that increases at all, does so by the workings of its own life. Thus grows the living plant, the living body, and every other thing that lives and grows. Its increase, according to its kind, is by the inward operations of its own peculiar life. Can it be otherwise as to the mind of man?

I am aware that the truth now stated, with some degree of emphasis, is familiar to my hearers; but my fear is, gentlemen, that you have not all given it the influence it should have on every one's manner of seeking intellectual improvement. Too many of those who are engaged in that pursuit, seem to have lost sight of it, in a great degree, plain and obvious as it is. It is practically overlooked, not only

by those who hope to become intelligent and learned, as a matter of course, because they live in a university, or in a literary society, and have abundance of books at command, though they are at almost no pains to improve their advantages; but by many others likewise, who seem seriously engaged in their studies. There are many of this latter class, who amid all their zeal for mental improvement, appear not to understand how it is that such improvement is to be acquired. They do, indeed, recognize the necessity of some sort of mental exertion on their own part; they apply themselves to books and lectures, and are much occupied, it may be, night and day; but still they are occupied only as one would be, who should labour with all his might to provide himself food, and yet never partake of it; or, to speak more accurately, who should eagerly partake of food, and then paralyze, or in some way restrain the digestive functions. What patient thought do these students exercise, in searching out the exact truth of whatever presents itself to their apprehensive faculty? Or what *intellectual* entertainment do they give to it? Are their minds impregnated, inspirited, moved to reflection and comparison, to analysis and inquiry, to abstraction and classification, or to any thing analogous to the processes of rumination and digestion? Do they pause to consider the *how*, the *why*, and the *wherefore*, of what meets their thought? Do they muse, and pry, and penetrate into unexplored recesses of truth? Nothing of the kind. They doubt, perhaps, whether such free and extended thinking be pious, or modest, or lawful; more probably they have not patience to endure so difficult and slow a method of cultivating the mind. Be the reason what it may, the result is, from the very nature of mind, that they make little or no solid improvement. Something they may gain by that exercise of attention which they give to the products of other minds; they come in this way to know that things of this and that name, or class, are among the materials of universal knowledge; but with the things themselves, they have no just acquaintance; and from such intercourse as they have with these things, it is, perhaps, questionable, whether, on the whole, their minds are more injured or improved. They acquire that sort of knowledge which inflates, but does not strengthen; which makes one wise in conceit, but foolish in discourse and action; which produces confidence

without clear conviction ; which capacitates men to despise and denounce others, and to carry themselves as gods, but not to forbear, and be gentle, and give instruction with meekness. They must needs move slowly, who would move surely and successfully up the hill of knowledge : it cannot be ascended in a day, or a month, or a year. Haste does only harm ; things must have their natural course, and they who cannot wait, should cease all expectation, and all hope, and betake themselves to some other pursuit. I wish I could write in every student's heart, that beautiful saying of ancient wisdom, "Truth is the daughter of Time." How many hurry through books and systems, as if rapidity in mental growth and in reading were the same thing. Not such as these become mighty in intellectual power ; this is the attainment of those sons of patience, who pause a year, it may be, on a volume or a theory, before they can exactly pronounce concerning it. They pause for reflection, and while they pause, life springs within them with new strength ; their minds grow apace ; they extend their views ; they see the wide and ever enlarging relations of things, and thus do they become more instructed by continued reflection on one book or page, than the other class of students by the reading of a life time. I repeat the sentiment : The human mind does not otherwise advance than by the exertion of its own living power. Things exterior to itself may favour its growth, but cannot make it grow. Converse with books, and lectures, and schools, will not suffice. Knowledge cannot be read into it, or lectured into it, or introduced into it in any way, except as the mind itself draws it, in and digests it, by its own patient thought and reflection.

And with this remark another should be connected : not only must the mind that would gain the just size and use of its powers, depend for that result on the inward workings of its own mysterious life, but it must designedly and diligently exert itself to keep those workings free of restraint. It must assert and maintain its liberty, which, from its circumstances, it cannot do without great decision and effort. The importance of the mind's being free of all restriction, and especially of a blind, servile reliance on other minds, in order to a just exercise and developement of its faculties, cannot be overrated. Nothing in the philosophy of mental discipline deserves more consideration. What remarkable examples have we of the congenialness of freedom to the mind of

man ! Some who now rank among the first of human minds, were almost classed with those of bare mediocrity, until they escaped from the yoke of an early bondage, and felt the elevating and enlarging power of mental independence. Perhaps there are few thinking men who are not, to some extent, examples of this influence. Who that is much addicted to thorough investigation has not sometimes found himself at a stand in his thoughts while looking to other minds for aid ; but after ceasing from that dependence, and applying himself to the subject as exclusively in his own strength as if it had never before engaged human attention, advanced with the utmost ease, and with wonder at his former embarrassment ? While I remember instances such as these, of the influence of freedom on the operations of the mind, I recoil with indignation at the evil of intellectual slavery. That the mass of men, however, should escape at once from this base bondage, desirable as it may be, is out of all hope : may even the expectation be indulged, that those heaven-selected few will be entirely emancipated, whose destination in life is to labour for the deliverance of their fellows, and who are now engaged in preparing themselves for that work. Is it not possible, gentlemen, to be too confident even in this expectation ! You admit, I doubt not, the importance of your having perfectly free minds in your disciplinary course : you see that nothing will so directly and greatly contribute to your success : you intend that your minds shall be free ; perhaps you think them free already. And yet you well know, that it is often the strongest of the chains of mental bondage, to have a full persuasion of not being at all subject to it. No one, you will admit, should be confident of exemption from this bondage, any further than he shares the heavenly liberty which the Son of God bestows, by his renewing and sanctifying power. A mind which could retain an independence on all created minds and influences, would still be a slave, unless free of self-conceit and the vassalage of sin. Here is the prime slavery of human intellect ; and he is but a specimen of the worst kind of madness, who boasts himself of mental liberty, while subject to ambition or any form of selfishness, or is a stranger to his ignorance and nothingness in the presence of the great God.

A truly free mind is of course an humble one, which, conscious of its moral imperfection, can make no boastful

pretensions of its liberty. It is modest in these pretensions, in proportion as the ground for them is strong and extensive. And this fact leads me to mention, as another essential principle in the philosophy of our subject, that *humility*, not less than liberty, lies at the basis of all solid improvement of the mind. Not only has a proud mind no true acquaintance with God and his truth; it can have but little knowledge, and no just appreciation of the powers and products of other human minds. What limit is there to that young person's self-idolatry, who can take but a glance at the various productions of human genius and learning, and retain a high conceit of his own powers and attainments! There is much of error, and much of useless speculation, and much that is pernicious in these productions; but there is so much of truth, and wisdom, and power in them also, that to know them but imperfectly, were enough to make any single mind amazed at its own ignorance and short coming. What more unpromising in a young man then, than to be growing in self-confidence and self-admiration, while pursuing a preparatory course of study? Seest thou a man, a young man especially, wise in his own conceit, there is more hope of a fool than of him. A student of this class studies unquestionably to worse than no purpose. He thinks himself in possession of perfect independence and power of mind; but who, to one capable of judging in such a case, appears in more pitiable imbecility and bondage?

It might be useful to show in some detail, if time permitted, how the quality just recommended should be expected to develope itself in the inmates of this Institution. I can, however, barely advert to two points, in which, I think it cannot but exemplify itself to every one, in whom it exists in any considerable degree. You declare, gentlemen, by your attendance here, that you do not despise exact system and rule in study, though prescribed not by yourselves. This well agrees with the supposition, that you have the true spirit of self-discipline, and especially that element of it of which I am remarking. You are persuaded that the prayerful consultations of wise and good men who have passed, and passed successfully through a course of Theological study, are more likely to originate a judicious plan to be pursued by those who are just entering on such a course, than they in their inexperience could originate for themselves. Hence your subjection of yourselves to the

settled regimen of our school. What else now can those expect from you, who would not forejudge you as insincere or fickle, but that your studies, even to the end, will be attended to, in strict observance of all our regulations; that you will give your time and your strength to such books and subjects as our order and discretion may prescribe, postponing your own contrariant wishes herein, to the fixed plan of the Institution; and that you will observe the very hours and seasons here set for study, recreation, and prayer; and not different, though to yourselves, individually, they might be more convenient ones, of your own appointing? All this, in honour to your claims to be held as sincere and consistent men, we ought to take for granted; and we shall take for granted, will, in all ordinary cases, be verified by fact.

Again; assuming that the root of sound self-discipline in this respect is within you, we cannot but anticipate that you will cherish and exhibit a peculiar spirit of modesty, in relation to the great subject matter of your studies in this place. Theology, it is true, so far as it proceeds beyond the certain announcements of revelation, consists in results of human reasoning and philosophizing. So far, of course, it should, like any other science, be examined and judged of freely, in the independent and just exercise of reason. It is the greatest possible violation of humility—it is an arrogation of the Divine authority, to demand an implicit belief in any system of Theology one hair-breadth farther than this. It is an assumption of the prerogative of the Most High. Think freely, therefore, gentlemen; think independently, think thoroughly for yourselves, on the subjects of Theological, as well as of every other science. In respect even to the first principles of revealed religion, there is no irreverence in the utmost liberty of thought, provided it be not licentiousness, under liberty's cloak. Nevertheless, it is a profane and haughty spirit that moves not softly, and tremblingly, and with great self-diffidence, over all the ground of Christian Theology. It were a manifest denial that the Scriptures are an inspired revelation, to suppose that the substantial truths which they contain remain yet to be ascertained; and those may see plainly, with whom they class themselves, who hesitate to adopt what has been the common faith of the Christian church in every age. Besides, there is something, in a manner sacred, in the uninspired thoughts and

speculations of sound Christian divines. Among these authors are not a few of the best and greatest of mankind; martyrs, confessors, and reformers; men of giant understandings, and hearts as large as the universe; and they have given us in their immortal works, the best fruits of their labours. I need not ask whether those can be very modest or very intelligent youths, who can hastily discard, or irreverently controvert, the doctrines and opinions of such men.

I have only to add in closing these familiar remarks on the principles of mental discipline, that the mind, like the body, needs its refectations and its remedies, and that want of attention to these may defeat every end of discipline, and be fatal to intellectual progress. Here, however, opens a very wide field, which I must not enter. Let me only say, that I deem this subject worthy of a much more thorough and philosophical examination than it has yet received—an examination, which, I trust, some one competent to the task will give to it. The importance of bodily temperance and exercise has been much insisted on; but the mind has a being of its own, independent of the body; and much as it may suffer by its union to the body, from corporeal infirmities, it has independent ailments and infirmities of its own; and if the body can injure the mind by being ill-conditioned, the mind, by the same cause, can injure the body, even to the speedy destruction of its life. Whence, I infer, that plans for promoting bodily health merely, omit much the more important part of what is needful, for the vigorous health of the mind. There is food, medicine, and exercise for the body, and these by their good influence on the body, may indirectly benefit the mind: but there is food, medicine, and exercise also for the mind; and the withholding of these may keep both mind and body diseased, and languishing, beyond hope of cure by human means.

## ART. VII. AUTHENTICITY OF I. JOHN V. 7, 8.

By Rev. WM. W. HUNT, Amherst, Mass.

IN KNAPP'S edition of the New Testament, I find a part of the seventh and eighth verses of the fifth chapter of John's first epistle included in double brackets. The passage begins after the clause, *ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες* (*there are three that bear record*), and includes the following: *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ πατήρ, ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι· Καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ (in heaven the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear record on earth).* In explanation of these brackets, the author says, in the preface, "His ea notantur quæ sine dubio spuria esse censebam;" (with these, i. e. brackets, those passages are marked which I suppose, without doubt, are spurious.) Such is the opinion of Dr. KNAPP, one of the most orthodox and learned biblical scholars in Europe. But what is the opinion of other critics on this subject?

Mr. SCOTT says, "It is well known that many volumes have been written concerning this passage, in order to prove or disprove its authenticity. But whether the Trinitarians interpolated it, or the Arians and other Unitarians omitted it, is, to this day, a matter of controversy, and not likely to be determined."

Mr. HENRY says, "There are some rational surmises that seem to support the present text and reading."

ROSENMUELLER says, "*Verba hæc non esse genuina ple-rorumque criticorum hodie est sententia;*" (that these words are not genuine is now the opinion of most critics.)

The BISHOP of ST. DAVIDS, after a minute and learned discussion, says, "Upon the whole view of the important and interesting subject of these pages—the evidences internal and external, direct and indirect, of the controverted verse are so many, so various, and so powerful, as to leave in my own mind no room to doubt that we have, in the testimony of the three heavenly witnesses, the authentic words of St. John."

Mr. NOLAN, (an English divine,) in an inquiry into the integrity of the Greek Vulgate, after stating the internal and external evidences for the verse, adds, "I trust nothing fur-

ther can be wanting to convince any ingenuous mind that i. John V. 7, really proceeded from St. John the evangelist."

Mr. GRIER, after noticing the arguments for the passage, says, "I feel compelled to abandon my former prejudices against the verse, and to think that a person should almost as soon doubt the genuineness of the rest of St. John's epistle, as that of the disputed passage."

Such are the opinions of some of the learned critics upon this passage.

From these contradictory opinions, I turn to the arguments by which they are supported.

1. In the first place it is argued *against* the passage, that it is not found in any of the ancient Greek manuscripts. While there are Greek manuscripts up to the fourth century, there are none, it is said, which contain this passage previous to the year 1300. This, it must be confessed, is a strong argument. It would seem that if the passage was contained in the autograph of the Apostle, it would have been preserved in *Greek*, along with the rest of the epistle, that it would have been found in some one of the many Greek manuscripts, scattered through the period of nine centuries. The omission is somewhat unaccountable, on the supposition of its genuineness.

2. The second argument against the passage is, its omission in many of the ancient and eastern versions. It is wanting in two Syriac versions, in the Arabic Polyglot, in the Coptic, in Ethiopian, in the Slavonic, in the Armenian, &c. The American missionaries to Palestine tell us that it is wanting in the New Testament which they found there; and Sir Wm. Jones, that it is wanting in the copy which he found among the Christians of India.

3. It is argued on this side of the question, that the passage is not quoted or referred to by any of the Greek fathers. Some of these fathers wrote continued commentaries on the New Testament, and on this very epistle;—they quote the preceding and subsequent clauses;—they had frequent occasion to quote this clause; but it is not referred to by any of them until the fifth, or, as is affirmed by some, the twelfth century. Would this have been the case, it is asked, if they had known of this passage? And would not some of them have known of it, if it ever belonged to a genuine copy of the epistle?

4. It is omitted in some of the manuscripts of the Vul-

gate, and in those which contain it, it appears in a variety of shapes, some placing the eighth verse before the seventh, others placing the seventh verse only in the margin. There is also a variety of readings in those Greek copies which contain the passage. Some, in the seventh verse, read *ἐν εἰς* (*are one*), others read *εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰς* (*are to one*), and in the eighth verse, instead of *ἐν τῇ γῇ* (*on earth*) one Greek edition reads *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* (*upon the earth*). From this variety of readings, it is contended that those transcribers who thought proper to insert the passage, had no certain reading before them, and therefore no sufficient authority for inserting it.

These are the principal arguments against the authenticity of the passage; and surely they are of such a nature as to shield one who doubts respecting it from suspicion and reproach.

But is there nothing to be said in favour of the passage?

1. In the first place, we find some negative arguments.

The omission of the passage in the Greek manuscripts, it is said, and very truly, can be easily accounted for; as the clause immediately preceding the passage, and the last clause in the passage itself, are precisely alike, except the addition in the latter case of *ἐν τῇ γῇ* which is generally allowed to be genuine. Now what was more easy and likely, than for the eye of a transcriber to be caught by so similar a clause, so near, and pass on without suspecting an intervening passage, especially if the last word ended both lines in the copy? Such mistakes are made by every transcriber. And an omission in one Greek manuscript would account for an omission in all the rest; since that one might be the copy from which they were all taken. Still further: an omission in the Greek *manuscripts*, would of course account for the omission in many of the versions and all the Greek fathers. Thus almost the entire argument against the passage is set aside, by supposing what might easily have occurred in transcribing. But this is not all. Suppose the passage wanting in all the Greek manuscripts until the year 1300. So also the Hymn to Ceres had been lost for sixteen centuries, when it was found in a manuscript at Moscow, and that manuscript written as late as the fourteenth century: yet no one ever doubted the genuineness of that hymn.

Besides, if there are no Greek manuscripts, but one, for the verse after the end of the third century, there are no Greek manuscripts against, before that period. And if no Greek

*fathers* quote such a Greek text; no Latin *heretics* ever objected to the Latin text. And further still, if no Greek father quoted 1 John V. 7, neither did any one quote 1 John V. 20, (this is the true God, &c.) during the first three centuries; or 1 Tim. iii. 16, (God was manifest in the flesh) for the first four centuries; and yet the genuineness of these passages is now established by incontestible evidence.

These are some of the *negative* arguments. And, certainly, every one must acknowledge that they very much reduce the weight of evidence against the passage.

2. The first *positive* argument which I shall introduce is, that the passage is found in the Latin version.

The value of this argument will be understood by a brief history of that version. I give it, for substance, from Robinson's Calmet and Horne's Introduction.

At a very early period the Scriptures were translated into Latin. In the time of Augustine, there were several of these versions; but only one of them adopted by the church, that is, by ecclesiastical authority. This was called *Vulgata* (common), because it was made from the Greek common version (*Koinē*). This version was made in the beginning of the second century. It was very literal, and gave scrupulously the meaning of the original. As the manuscripts had become corrupted, revision was undertaken by *Jerome* in the year 383, in pursuance of a commission from the Bishop of Damascus. While Jerome was employed in this revision, he ventured to commence a new version of his own, out of the originals, by the counsel of his friends, and from his own sense of the necessity of such a work. This was completed A. D. 405. He enjoyed the oral instruction of learned Jewish Rabbis of Palestine, and availed himself of all the former Greek versions, and of the Hexapla of Origen. His new version exceeded all others in usefulness. It preserves many true readings, where the modern Hebrew copies are corrupted. It gradually acquired so great authority in the West of Europe, that ever since the seventh century, it has been exclusively adopted by the Roman Church. This is called the Modern Vulgate. It is almost as old, as the oldest Greek manuscript. It was made by one of the most learned of men. He resided in a central position, about equally distant from the two grand seats of learning and religion, Rome and Constantinople. He had before him a Latin version two centuries older than

any Greek manuscript now extant. He had access to all former Greek versions, and of course to many Greek manuscripts. His version was widely circulated, was contested, but stood the test. It is acknowledged to contain the true reading, in many places where the Hebrew is corrupted, and in some, where the Greek manuscripts are mutilated.

This version contains the passage before us. And this fact must be regarded as strong evidence of its genuineness. But this is not all.

3. The passage was quoted at a very early period.

The following is acknowledged to be the language of Cyprian: "*Dicit Deus, 'ego et Pater unum sumus,' et iterum de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto, scriptum est, et hi tres unum sunt,*" ("The Lord says 'I and the father are one: and again, of the Father and Son and Holy Ghost, it is written 'these three are one.') *Scriptum est* evidently implies that what follows (*hi tres unum sunt*) was extant in Scripture. But where is this phrase found in the Scripture, except in the verse now under consideration, and especially connected with *Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto*? Nor does it weaken the evidence of Cyprian's reference to this verse, that he employs the term *Filio* instead of *Verbo*, as both words mean the same thing, and the former was the more usual appellation of Christ in that age.

Cyprian then does quote the passage; and it is admitted that it was quoted by Fulgentius.

Now Cyprian was born in the year 240 and Fulgentius 464. The former wrote nearly a century before the date of the earliest Greek manuscript. That he used Greek copies is acknowledged even by Griesbach. They were both of them learned men, and had the means of knowing what was genuine, as well as any other men.

MILL, an English editor of a Greek Testament with various readings and critical notes, says of this evidence; that it would be abundantly sufficient to authenticate the seventh verse, if that verse were found in no copy from their time to the present day.

The passage is said, (nor do I know that it is disputed,) to have the testimony of the African Bishops of the fifth century: which, as some one observes, is equal to an hundred manuscripts of the same age; ("*Instar centenorum codicum qui optimæ notæ sunt seculi quinti.*")

There is also not a little evidence, that the passage is

quoted or referred to by distinguished Greek writers of the third and fourth century; and it is found in all the printed editions of the Greek Testament. Every editor, it seems, thought there was sufficient reason for inserting it, and the earlier editors did not even suspect that it was spurious.

Such are some of the *external* evidences urged in favour of the verse. There are some *internal* ones; or, as Henry calls them "rational surmises." Some have thought that the general scope of the Apostle *requires* the seventh verse. Bishop Horsely says, that the sense *absolutely* requires it: but Sir Isaac Newton says, that the connexion is best preserved by expunging it; while another commentator suggests, that the sense would be rendered more perspicuous by the omission both of the seventh and eighth verses.

An argument from the *general scope* can have no great weight on either side; still we may be allowed in some "rational surmises."

If the words *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, (*on earth*) which are found in some of the early Greek manuscripts, are genuine, and they are generally allowed to be, then the seventh verse seems to be necessary; for why should the Apostle say that there are three that bear record *on earth*, unless he had spoken of witnesses somewhere else?

There is another thing. Bishop Middleton, whose opinion is law on the subject of the Greek article, says, that *το* before *ἐν* in the eighth verse necessarily implies a reference to something that has gone before—"These three agree in *the one*." What one? Nothing is said about any *one*, if the seventh verse be rejected. In that verse there is a *one*: and the article *το* is clearly a reference to that.

A Professor of Greek, distinguished for critical accuracy in that language, on being shown this construction, gave it as his decided conviction, that the article here *absolutely* requires the disputed passage, and that, while he never before felt at liberty to use that passage as a proof text (not having before carefully observed the article and the preposition), he should not hesitate to use it *thus* in future.

There is another argument from the grammatical construction. Take away the disputed passage, and there are three neuter nouns connected with a masculine article and a masculine participle, which certainly is a very singular construction. True, there is something masculine in the idea of witnesses: true, too, there is the same construction

if that passage be inserted; yet the figure of *attraction* would account for it in that case. With the seventh verse, the language is good Greek; without that verse, it is at least somewhat solecistical.

Such, as I think, is a fair view of the question before us. To which side shall we incline?

If the arguments were exactly *balanced*, charity should incline us to receive the passage. Its omission can be accounted for without involving the moral character of any one; but its interpolation could hardly be less than direct and wilful forgery in the revelation of God. Now charity thinketh no evil; it requires evidence before it permits a suspicion, much more before it authorizes so serious a charge.

There is another consideration of the same nature. The Bible is the revelation of God, and the only one which he has given to men. Here are the words of eternal life,—the truths by which men are to be saved. It is immensely important that this book, as a whole, have all the weight of Divine authority. Now what is the influence upon the community, of rejecting a part of it—of calling a verse, here and there, spurious? Other verses are soon suspected, especially if they reveal an unpleasant doctrine, or inculcate an unpleasant duty. The public confidence is shaken, and infidelity is encouraged.

There is another consideration still. It is admitted on all hands, that the sentiment of the passage is found in other parts of the word of God. Unitarians themselves assent to this, contending that, if this verse were genuine, the *unity* here spoken of, would be only the same as that in which the Saviour declared that he and the Father were one.

If then the arguments *for* and *against* the verse were *equally balanced*, there are strong reasons in favour of admitting it. But, unless I am much mistaken, there is a decided preponderance in *favour* of the verse. The evidence *against* the passage is all *negative*, simply a want of evidence in favour, which is always regarded as an inferior kind of evidence: while the evidence in *favour* is, the great portion of it, *positive*. The evidence *against* begins in the fourth century; decided evidence in *favour* is found by the middle of the third. The evidence *against* can easily be accounted for; the evidence in *favour* would require some almost inadmissible suppositions. There is no evidence

*against* from the passage itself; while the language is the language of John, and the principles of Greek construction, which would otherwise be violated, are here sustained. In view of all this, then, I am constrained to admit the genuineness of the passage, and until new, and weightier evidence arise, I shall adopt, in reference to this subject the practice of Cecil. "I have," said he, "a shelf in my study for tried authors, and one in my mind for tried principles and characters. When an author has stood a thorough examination, and will bear to be taken as a guide, I put him on the shelf. A hundred subtle objections may be brought against this principle, I may meet with some of them perhaps; but my principle is on the shelf. Generally I may be able to recall the reasons which weighed with me to put it there; but if not, I am not to be sent out to sea again. Time was when I saw through and detected the subtleties that could be brought against it. I have past evidence of having been fully convinced, and there on the shelf it shall lie."

---

#### ART. VIII. REVIEW OF UPHAM ON THE WILL.

By Rev. ENOCH POND, Professor at Bangor, Me.

*A Philosophical and Practical treatise on the Will. By Thomas C. Upham, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College, 1834.*

(Continued from Vol. I. p. 539)

THE views of Prof. Upham are substantially the same with those of Edwards; but the plan and object of his work are different. President Edwards had constantly in view the clearing and establishing of certain important conclusions of a theological nature; and he went into the subject of the Will only so far, and in such connexions, as it bore upon these conclusions. Whereas Prof. Upham investigates the subject without any particular reference to its theological bearing, and pursues it altogether upon general principles. He seems to forget, for the time, and

would have his readers forget, all the knotty questions which have been agitated respecting "free-will and fore-knowledge absolute," and enters upon the subject as one of independent philosophical inquiry.

Prof. Upham divides his work into four parts; the first relating to the general nature of the will; the second to its laws; the third to its freedom; and the fourth to its powers. In the first part, there is a classification of our mental states into the *intellectual*, the *sentient*, and the *voluntary*; and the relation of the two former of these states to the latter, which constitutes the principal topic of inquiry, is clearly pointed out. In the second part, the important fact that the Will, like every other mental faculty, has its laws—as the law of causation, and the law of uniformity, on the ground of which its operations may be calculated on and predicted—is established by a great variety of proof. In the third part it is proved, that this subjection of the will to law is not at all inconsistent with its freedom, but that both these facts—the freedom of the will, and its subjection to law—are to be received, each on its own appropriate evidence, whether they can be satisfactorily harmonized by us, or not. In the fourth part, there is a full discussion of the subject of voluntary power, in which Prof. Upham discards the self-determining power of the will, in the sense in which this phrase was understood by Edwards, as inconceivable and impossible.

It has been already observed, that Prof. Upham considers our mental states under three divisions, the *intellectual*, the *sentient*, and the *voluntary*. We have no doubt that this classification is correct, and that it is worthy to be adopted by all subsequent writers on the philosophy of mind. It accords with the testimony of consciousness, and of common sense, and is recognized in the various languages of men. A thought is not a feeling, nor is a feeling a volition. These three mental states are obviously distinct, and are to be referred to distinct departments of the human mind.

Most writers on intellectual philosophy have distinguished between the understanding and will, or between the intellectual, and the sentient and voluntary powers; while not a few have confounded these two latter powers, reckoning either the sentient states of mind as voluntary, or the voluntary states as sentient. It will be our principal object,

in what follows, to trace out the so frequently unobserved distinction between the sentient and the voluntary powers of man, or between his feelings and his moral exercises. We shall pursue this distinction more in detail than it came within the plan of Prof. Upham to do, and exhibit some of its important bearings in relation to the great subject of experimental religion.

Our sentient feelings may be divided into several classes; and the first among them, which requires to be mentioned, is our *appetites*. The appetites, such as hunger, thirst, &c., are feelings in the mind, occasioned by particular states of the body. We are not directly voluntary in them. They constitute powerful motives to action, but are not themselves voluntary action. They were given us for an important purpose, and should be kept under a wise controul, but do not themselves possess a moral character.

Next to the appetites may be classed the *natural affections*, such as pity, and parental love. The love of parents for their children is not itself of a moral nature. It is not action, but a powerful motive to action, impelling those who possess it to provide for the little ones committed to their care. It is a mere feeling, which we have in common with the brutes, and which, like the appetites, should be duly regulated and controlled. The same, in general, may be said of the feeling of pity, and of all those feelings which are commonly classed under the head of natural affections.

There is a class of feelings denominated *muscular*, as they are supposed to arise from a particular state of the muscular system. The playfulness of the child, the weariness of the labourer, and the lassitude of the aged and infirm, are instances of this kind of feeling. No one can doubt that such feelings have a near connexion with the will, and a powerful influence upon it; and yet no one can regard them as directly voluntary.

To the sentient part of our nature belong the large class of *nervous* feelings or affections. These affections are not voluntary, and of course do not possess a moral character. They are *mere feelings* springing up in the mind, on account of a particular state of the body—the nerves. In some states of nerves, persons are cheerful; in others they are melancholy. Sometimes they laugh, and then they weep. These nervous affections often assume a *religious* aspect, and lead those under their influence to rejoice in

hope, or to tremble with apprehension, or to sink in the darkness of despair. Still, there is nothing in them of a truly religious nature, and they are not to be confided in, as affording decisive evidence of character, one way or the other.

Among the sentient feelings may be classed, the various *emotions* and *passions*,—such as surprise, astonishment, wonder; the emotions of beauty, grandeur, sublimity; joy, sorrow, grief, fear, anger. In the same class may be included feelings of regret and of gladness; feelings of approbation and disapprobation; the feeling of moral obligation to do what is right, and of remorse when we do wrong. Among the sentient feelings, we also include a class of instinctive desires and aversions, such as the universal desire of happiness and aversion to misery.

We here speak of these emotions or feelings in their simple state. They may doubtless be indulged under circumstances, and to a degree, that may give them a moral character. But in their simple state, they seem to be mere constitutional feelings, implanted for wise purposes, and which it is our duty to regulate and control. They spring up spontaneously in the mind, on the presentation of their appropriate objects. They are not exercises of the will, but operate in a thousand ways, to move and influence the will. They are intimately connected with our moral affections, and yet are clearly and entirely distinct from them.

This will appear, as we proceed to speak of our moral exercises or affections, and to show in what they consist. Our moral exercises are all exercises of *the will*. They are all, in some sense, *voluntary*. There is nothing pertaining to us which can be said strictly to possess a moral character—nothing sinful or holy, right or wrong—in which we are not voluntary.

But though all our moral exercises are exercises of the will, and in this respect are to be distinguished from our mere feelings, still, it may be proper to speak of them under several classes. And the first to be mentioned is, that of our *simple choices* or *volitions*. These include a vast number of our mental exercises. Every word we speak, every limb we move, every external action we perform, implies a previous choice or volition. We will to raise the hand, and we raise it. We will to open our lips and speak,

and it is done. And so of every other voluntary motion of the body.—These simple choices are rapid in their succession, and short in their duration. Each fixes upon something supposed to be directly within our power, and requiring immediately to be done; and with the doing of it, the volition passes away, and another of the same kind succeeds.

In this respect, our simple choices differ widely from our *purposes*, our *resolutions*, our *intentions*. A purpose embraces a plan or course of conduct, more or less general, and requires often a vast number of simple choices to carry it into effect. An individual purposes to go a journey. He forms the purpose deliberately and of choice. He is as voluntary in it as he can be in any thing; and the purpose, the plan itself, is one. But how many steps must be taken, and how many simple choices put forth, in order to bring him to his journey's end.

Our purposes often are so general as to include, not only a multitude of simple choices, but several distinct purposes under them. A young man, for example, purposes to become a preacher of the gospel, and to pursue a course of study preparatory to this important work. But, as he revolves the subject in his mind, he perceives that a great many subordinate purposes must be formed, in order to carry this greater and more general purpose into effect. And very likely, in the course of his preparatory studies, he repeatedly changes some of these subordinate purposes, while the general purpose to become a herald of salvation remains unshaken.

A *resolution* is a fixed choice or purpose to do something, or to attempt the doing of it, at some future period. Thus, we resolve to perform a particular action to-morrow, and something else the next week, and something else the next year. These resolutions are deliberately formed, formed in view of motives, and are exercises of the will. Still, they differ materially from those more simple exercises of the will, by which they are carried into effect.—If it should be objected, that we sometimes resolve to perform certain actions *immediately*—to do them *now*, it would be sufficient to reply, that the resolving to do them, is not the doing of them—that the resolution, in this case, and the simple choice by which it is to be accomplished, are very different things.

An *intention* is a choice, a purpose to bring about a par-

ticular end, by means of some overt act or actions. For this reason, our intentions are sometimes denominated motives.\* Thus we frequently ask, when we see an outward action performed, "What was the *motive* of him who performed it?" meaning by the inquiry, "What was his *intention*?" That we are voluntary in our intentions, is evident from their nature. They partake of the nature of a choice. The same is farther evident, since to the intention, and to this alone, attaches the entire moral character of the external action springing out of it. What is the overt act, the mere motions of the body, separate from the intention, out of which these motions grow? Judas came into the garden with much apparent cordiality, and said to Jesus, "Hail, Master, and kissed him." But who thinks the better of Judas for this, so long as we know that his intention was to betray his master into the hands of his enemies? And who thinks the better of any person for an overt action seemingly kind, when we know that the intention is hostile and evil?

Another class of our voluntary exercises consists of our *desires* or *wishes*. The term desire is sometimes used to express affections which are not voluntary—mere *feelings*, which belong to the sentient part of man. Thus our appetites, and our natural affections, are not unfrequently called desires. There are also certain universal and instinctive desires, as the desire of knowledge, and the desire of happiness. But that, in a large class of those exercises which are commonly denominated desires or wishes, we are voluntary, and that these exercises possess a moral character, there can be no doubt. The thief perceives it possible to obtain a sum of money by stealth; he earnestly *desires* to obtain it; he resolves that he will obtain it; and he enters on a course of measures accordingly. Now it would be difficult to show that this thief was not as voluntary and as criminal in his desires, as in his subsequent resolutions and endeavours. Indeed, may not the foundation of his guilt be traced, to the indulgence of these guilty desires?—David Brainerd conceived it possible, by much sacrifice

\* The term *motive* is used in metaphysics in three different senses; first, to signify *external* or *objective motives*; secondly, to denote those *sentient feelings* which are awakened in the mind by the presentation of external motives; and thirdly, in the sense above alluded to, or to express our *intentions*, which operate as motives to overt action.

and exertion, to bring some of the American Indians to a knowledge of the Saviour. He earnestly *desired* the accomplishment of this important object; he resolved that he would attempt its accomplishment; and he entered on a course of measures accordingly. Now, is there nothing morally excellent and holy in these benevolent desires of Brainerd? Was he not commendable and praiseworthy, before God and men, for indulging them? And is it not evident, from this consideration, that his desires were voluntary?

Our desires, in the sense in which we here use the term, are in reality *choices*, *preferences*, and differ from our simple choices, chiefly in respect to their object. They fasten upon objects which are not immediately attainable; if the object of a desire were immediately attainable—if by a single movement, we could put our hand upon it, and secure it, the desire would become a simple choice, a volition, and the object in question would be attained.\* Indeed, a desire, in the voluntary sense of the term, may be defined to be a wish, a preference, a choice, of something which is not immediately attainable.

Possibly there are other voluntary exercises, which come not under either of the classes which have been mentioned. Such may be some of those religious exercises, which are made the subject of express command in the Scriptures. We cannot conceive that God should directly require any thing of his creatures, in which they are not voluntary, or that he should command them to put forth exercises over which they have no controul. He may command us, and he does, to cultivate our understandings, and to regulate our sentient feelings; because in doing this, the will is concerned. But he does not command us to have *mere feelings*, when the appropriate occasions for them are not present to us; nor to repress them altogether, when the occasions are present. He does not command the man, who has long

\* Dr. Brown says, "Those brief feelings, on which certain bodily movements are immediately consequent, are commonly termed *volitions*; while the more lasting wishes, which have no such direct termination, are simply denominated *desires*. Thus we are said to *desire* wealth, and to *will* the motion of our hand. But if the motion of our hand had not followed our desire of moving it, we should then have been said, not to *will*, but to *desire* its motion. The *distance*, or the *immediate attainableness* of the good, is thus **THE SOLE DIFFERENCE.**" Cause and effect, p. 34. To the same effect, see Payne's Elements, p. 370. "There is no radical difference," says Payne, "between *will* and *desire*."

been destitute of food, not to feel the sensation of hunger; nor does he require him, when his cravings are satisfied, to call up such a sensation. He does not forbid the kind parent to feel parental affection; nor does he require those who are not parents to have such affection. He does not forbid us, when an object of distress is before our eyes, to feel emotions of pity; nor does he require us to feel such emotions, when no object of distress is present. And so of our sentient feelings generally. We are required to regulate and cultivate them, and to have them under a wise controul. We are also to express them in all proper ways, and on suitable occasions. We are to "rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep." But we are not required to excite these feelings, and to put them forth, when there is no occasion for them; neither to repress and eradicate them, when there is occasion. In a word, they are not the subjects of *direct* command. Our voluntary exercises are commanded or forbidden, according as they are right or wrong; but our involuntary states of mind, except as it regards the regulation and expression of them, are not the subjects of prohibition or command, and there is no reason why they should be.

Some of our commanded religious exercises are obviously voluntary, as submission to God, a choosing of him for our portion, and a willingness to be in his hands and at his disposal. But there are others which have been thought to be of a different character. Such, for example, is *love* to God. 'Love,' it is said, 'is never a voluntary affection. Who can love or hate at pleasure? Does it depend on the will, the choice of the parent, whether he shall love his children; or on the choice of endeared and devoted friends, whether they shall love one another?'—The difficulty in this case, if there be any, arises entirely from an ambiguity in the meaning of the word, *love*. This word is sometimes used to express feelings purely sentient; as in the case of parental and sexual love. And if it had no higher sense when applied to God, there would be no more holiness in loving God, than there is in the fondness of animals for their young, or in the attachment of the turtle to his mate.\* But

\* The venerable John Newton, in one of his letters to Hannah More, says, "We seem to want some other word by which to denote our supreme regard to God, than that which expresses our affection to creatures. When we speak of *loving him*, it must be in a different sense. Creature love is a passion;

this word is also used to express a holy, voluntary affection. We are required to love all men with a love of benevolence; or, in other words, we are to desire and seek their good. But such an exercise is voluntary. We are required to love all good men with a love of complacency; which implies that, in view of their holy and amiable characters, we choose them as our friends, and prefer them above all others, as those with whom to take sweet counsel, and in whom to repose confidence and affection. But this exercise, too, is voluntary. We are required to love God, with a supreme and constant love. But what does this mean? Not that we are to cherish towards him a mere *sentient feeling*,—but that, in view of the infinite excellencies and glories of his character, and the relations subsisting between him and us, we choose him as the portion of our soul—prefer him above every other object—desire, above all things, to please and honour him—and seek our happiness in him, and in him alone, forever. This is to love God with a holy, voluntary affection, as he has most reasonably required in his law. And this is the only love of God, which is of any value in his sight.

Should it be insisted, that there is a *feeling of delight in God* involved in all our exercises of love to him, and that without this feeling he is never embraced as the portion of the soul; we are far from denying the existence of such a feeling. But to which department of the mind is it to be referred? Undoubtedly to the *sentient*; and it should be regarded rather as a motive to love, or perhaps, in many instances, as a consequent sensation, than as constituting any part of that holy, voluntary affection which is represented in the Scriptures as the fulfilling of the law.

It has been doubted whether *repentance* is a voluntary affection. But what is repentance? Not conviction, or distress, or sorrow. "Godly sorrow *worketh* repentance," but is not itself repentance. Repentance is a voluntary turning from sin. Viewing sin to be (what it is) unreasonable, base and odious in the extreme, the true penitent renounces it, turns away from it, and condemns and abhors himself on account of it. Without doubt, there is much more feeling, as well as intellectual light, involved in exer-

Divine love is a *principle*. It arises from an apprehension of his adorable perfections, especially as they are displayed in the great work of redemption." "There is a sensibility of feeling in creature love, which is no proper standard of our love to God." *Memoirs of H. More*, vol. i, p. 359.

cises of true penitence. But then, repentance does not consist, either in mere feeling or intellectual light, but in a voluntary renouncing, and turning away from sin.

It has been questioned, also, whether *faith* is a voluntary exercise. But in order to understand the nature of this exercise, it is only necessary to distinguish between the *act* of faith, and that which is implied in it. There is certainly much, that is not voluntary, implied in faith; such as an acquaintance with the material facts and doctrines of the gospel, and an intellectual assent to the truth of these doctrines. But mere intellectual prerequisites, such as these, do not constitute evangelical faith. Such faith consists essentially in a voluntary committing of the lost soul to Christ—in a giving up of one's whole guilty and ruined self to him—in reposing affectionately, confidently, and exclusively upon his outstretched and omnipotent arm, for deliverance and salvation. Such is the *act of faith*; and it is evidently an act in which the subject of it is free and voluntary.

It would be needless to proceed farther in analyzing and examining the different religious exercises. Suffice it to say, that we hold every such exercise, so far as it is the subject of direct command, and so far as it partakes of the nature of holiness, to be a *voluntary* exercise—to belong to the voluntary, and not to the sentient part of our nature. God has never required any thing of his creatures, in which they were not, in some sense, voluntary; nor does he regard them as holy or sinful, or as entitled either to reward or punishment, for any thing which they have not themselves voluntarily done.

From the description which has here been given of the voluntary part of man, and the classification which has been attempted of his voluntary exercises, we may see in what *regeneration* essentially consists. Regeneration implies much previous light and knowledge in the understanding; but the great and needed change does not lie here. A person may be enlightened to any extent, and still not be regenerated, or be any the less guilty in the sight of God. Indeed, guilt, in the unregenerate, uniformly increases, in proportion to the degree of their resisted light. Regeneration, too, implies a waking up of the benumbed sensibilities—an exciting and quickening of the feelings; but neither does the change under consideration lie here. The feelings

of sinners in the day of judgement, and in the world of despair, will be intensely excited, so much so, that they will bite and gnaw their tongues for pain; and yet they will not repent of their evil deeds.

Regeneration is a change of the *voluntary exercises*—a change of the desires, purposes, and affections of the soul. Till the voluntary part of man is changed, the seat of the sore within him is not touched. The dominion of sin is not broken. Till the voluntary part is renewed and sanctified, he is destitute of that holiness without which no man can see the Lord.

But it is not enough to say, that regeneration is a change in the voluntary affections; it is a change in all the different classes of these affections. It involves a change, not only in our simple choices or volitions, but in our purposes, intentions, desires, and in all the voluntary affections of the soul. From a want of attention to this point, some good men have failed to make an adequate representation of the subject of regeneration. It has been said by some, that the sinner may change his own heart as easily as he can move his tongue, or lift his hand. 'In changing the heart he is voluntary, and in lifting the hand he is voluntary, and one voluntary act may be performed as easily as another.' But although in both the actions here referred to the subject is voluntary, yet obviously they are very different in their nature—so different, that the one cannot, with any propriety, be introduced to illustrate the other. In lifting the hand, a simple choice or volition only is concerned; but in regeneration, there is much requiring to be changed, besides our simple choices or volitions. Our desires, our purposes, indeed all the voluntary affections of the soul must be changed, so that old things may pass away with us, and all things become spiritually new.

Some have said, that regeneration is a change in the *ultimate purpose* of the soul. Previous to regeneration, the ultimate purpose of every person is to *gratify self*; but subsequent to regeneration, the ultimate purpose is to *glorify God*. Now, though it is certain that, in regeneration, this ultimate purpose is always changed; and though the ultimate purpose may never be changed without regeneration; yet, to represent regeneration as a mere change of the ultimate purpose, is far from being an adequate view of the subject. The hearts of men, their voluntary exercises,

do not consist of mere purposes. There are desires, there are preferences, there are various forms of voluntary affection, which, in connexion with the change of purpose, require also to be renewed and sanctified. In view of the holy and excellent character of God, the sinner must begin to love him—must choose him as the portion of his soul, and prefer him above every other object—before he will change the whole purpose of his life, and devote himself to the glory of his Maker.

It is obvious from what has been said in the foregoing pages, that the sentient part of man lies between his intellectual and his voluntary part, and forms an important connecting link betwixt the one and the other.—In approaching our fellow beings, with a view to exert an influence upon them, we first address ourselves to their intellectual nature. We address them through the medium of the senses, and infuse ideas into their minds. But no sooner do these ideas enter their minds, than they awaken emotion, *feeling*, of some kind or other; and thus bring us in contact with the sentient man. But if the ideas communicated are of an interesting character, the process of influence will not stop here. These awakened feelings, in connexion with the ideas which have awakened them, will operate as motives to the will, and decisive action will be the result.—The position of the sentient nature, between the intellectual and the voluntary, and the influence which it exerts, one way and the other, is clearly illustrated by Prof. Upham.

"The understanding, whatever opinions may have formerly prevailed on the subject, is, in no case, in direct contact with the will. When, therefore, we speak of the operation of the intellect upon the will, we mean an indirect or circuitous operation; that is to say, one which is carried on *through the mediation of the sensibilities*." "Strike out the sensibilities, therefore, and you necessarily excavate a gulf of separation between the intellect and the will, which is forever impassable. There is, from that moment, no medium of communication, no bond of union, no reciprocal action."

It is the more important that this point be satisfactorily settled, because some good men, in their speculations, seem to have placed the sensibilities, at least such of them as are brought into exercise on the subject of religion, on the other side of the will. The faculty of feeling, or the heart, (as they term it,) lies back of the will, is deeper down in the profundities of the soul, and requires a more thorough operation of the Holy Spirit radically to affect it. Tell such persons that regeneration is a change in the voluntary exer-

cises—the exercises of the will, and you seem to them to represent it as a superficial work. It is not sufficiently deep and thorough. It does not go down to the feelings of the heart.—But we have seen in this discussion, that the whole sentient region lies between the intellect and the will, and that a change in the mere feelings, which did not reach the exercises of the will, would be superficial indeed. In a religious point of view, it would be worthless. There is nothing deeper in the soul than its voluntary exercises, including its intentions, preferences, desires and purposes. There can be nothing better in the sight of God than a renewal of these. In these voluntary affections, previous to sanctification, is the seat of all sin. In these, subsequent to sanctification, is the seat of all holiness. These constitute, in the religious sense of the term, the *heart*,—out of the good treasure of which proceed all good things,—the *heart*, which we are required to keep with all diligence, since out of it are the issues of life.

From what has been said, we see the futility of an objection commonly urged against *the entire sinfulness of unregenerate men*. When this important doctrine is inculcated and enforced, we are often pointed, by way of objection, to the amiable natural dispositions and affections of certain unregenerate persons. We are told how kind they are in their families; how much they love their children, and how well they provide for them; and how pitiful they are to objects in distress.—Now certainly we would not say a word to discourage the cultivation and proper development of the amiable natural affections. These affections were implanted for important purposes, and they should be cultivated, and be made to exert their appropriate influence. But it is important to be said and understood, that these affections, however amiable, do not partake of the nature of religion or holiness. They belong to the sentient, and not to the moral part of man. They are mere feelings, and not voluntary exercises. They operate as powerful motives to action, but are not action, and do not, in themselves, possess a moral character. Openly vicious men, who profane the name of God, and trample upon his authority and institutions, often love their children, and provide for them, as well as others. They are pitiful, too, to objects in distress, and willing to exert themselves to afford relief. The very brutes possess these natural affections in great strength,

and often act under their influence; but the brutes are not on this account holy, nor do they possess a moral character.

To have stupified, and blunted, and in great measure eradicated the amiable natural affections, by long continued habits of sin, does indeed imply extreme depravity. It implies that those who have done it, and have become (as the apostle expresses it) "without natural affection," are far gone in wickedness. But to possess these natural affections in high degrees, and to act habitually under their influence, does not necessarily imply the exercise of holiness. Persons may act in this way from year to year, and be useful in their families, and respected in society, and never once think of God, or feel under any particular obligations to God, or have the least regard, in what they do, to his authority or glory.

It has been observed already, that moral depravity has its seat in the voluntary affections. There is nothing within us, which can be regarded as partaking of the nature of sin, in which we are not voluntary. But it is a mistake to suppose that the *influence* of depravity is felt only in the voluntary affections. Its baneful influence extends out into every department of the mind, impairing, deforming and corrupting all. The influence of depravity upon the understanding is to darken, weaken, confuse and blind it. The influence of depravity upon the conscience is to sear and stupify it, and unfit it to perform effectively its important functions. The influence of depravity upon the sentient feelings is to throw them into confusion and disorder; to blunt and impair those of the higher kind—those which prompt to holy action; and to strengthen and increase those of an opposite tendency—those under the influence of which temptation predominates, and the soul is drawn into the vortex of sin.

It is on account of this disordered state of the sentient feelings, that external motives operate so strangely upon the mass of men; that what ought to be the weaker motive so often predominates; and that considerations which ought to have great weight and influence produce so little effect. The sentient part of the man is so disordered and deranged,—the nobler sensibilities are so blunted and stupified, and the baser ones are so increased and strengthened—that the motives in favour of sin, which are intrinsically weakest, and which ought to be spurned at as of no account, awaken

interest, excite feeling, and ultimately carry away the will ; whereas the motives in favour of holiness, which are intrinsically strong, and ought to prevail with uniform and overwhelming power, excite little or no interest, meet no correspondent emotion waking up in the soul, and have no effective influence to redeem the will from that bondage of corruption in which it is enslaved.

The situation of sinners, as here set forth, is indeed fearful and deplorable. They are endowed with noble faculties and susceptibilities—every thing that they need, in order to constitute them moral agents, and render them capable of knowing God, and doing their duty. And God justly holds them responsible for the use of their faculties, and requires that they serve him to the full extent of their powers. But they have sinned—sinned long, and with a high hand—and by this means, the whole mind has become impaired and disordered. The understanding is darkened, the conscience is seared, the noble sensibilities are benumbed, the baser ones are strengthened, and the powers of the soul all lie in disorder and ruins.—And here is the inability, of which sinners complain, to love God and do their duty. Their inability is altogether moral, and altogether criminal. It arises, not from a want of faculties or powers, but from the inveterate love, and the long continued and universal prevalence of sin, by which the habit of sin has become confirmed, and has shed its blighting, disastrous influence over all the susceptibilities of the soul.

From what has been said, we learn not only the *necessity* for the special operations of the Holy Spirit in conversion, but the appropriate *sphere* of these operations.—The necessity for the special operations of the Holy Spirit, in order to the conversion of the soul, is absolute ;—not however, as we have said, on account of any essential defect in the constitution of man, or any want of natural ability to do his duty ; but on account of his voluntary sinfulness, and the influence of this sinfulness in darkening the mind, searing the conscience, and deranging and impairing, more or less, every part of the mental and moral system.

The first work of the Divine Spirit is, probably, to pour light into the understanding. It is to present the truths and motives of the gospel in such a manner as to excite attention. But we are not to limit the influence of the Spirit to the mere work of presenting external motives. Some, we know,

very low and inadequate ideas of the operations of the Holy Spirit.

From the understanding, the Spirit passes into the sentient mind, wakes up the benumbed sensibilities, and corrects the disorders which sin has occasioned there. Under these influences of the Spirit, the sinner begins to *feel*—feel the force of moral obligation—feel the urgent claims of duty—feel remorse, distress, and alarm in view of his sins. The world, for the time, loses its power with him; temptation is disarmed of its wonted influence; while the truths and motives of the gospel come down upon the soul with prodigious weight.

From the sentient part of the man, the Spirit soon passes, unless he is resisted and grieved away, to the voluntary part. The external motives of the gospel, combining with the awakened sensibilities within, predominate over all opposing influences; the will is bowed; the heart is humbled; and the work of sanctification is commenced.

An important part of what is usually called the strivings of the Spirit, and a part which we think has been too much overlooked, is confined to the sentient region of the soul. Here, an important preparatory work is to be done. Previous to the commencement of the Spirit's striving, every thing is in confusion here. Temptations to sin strike the mind powerfully, awaken interest, and carry away the captive will; while the exciting truths and motives of the gospel are presented and urged in vain.

Yet, in all these operations of the Spirit, no law of the mind is suspended, and the free and regular exercise of no faculty is restrained. The subject of them feels that he has experienced a great change, a glorious change; and he devoutly ascribes it to the sovereign grace of the Holy Spirit. Still, he has been conscious of no constraint put upon any of his faculties. He knows that, from first to last, he has had the free exercise of his thoughts and feelings; that he has acted under the influence of motives, and acted freely.

The views which have been taken of this subject enable us to detect an *ambiguity in certain terms*, which, in various ways, is having an unhappy influence. There is a class of terms which are used to express both the sentient feelings, and the voluntary exercises; and on this account, these entirely different classes of affections are sometimes

mistaken the one for the other. Thus, the term *desire*, which, for the most part, expresses moral affections, is in some instances used to signify *feelings* which are sentient and instinctive. And the word *love*, which (in religion) is commonly used to express a moral exercise, sometimes denotes a mere natural feeling or affection. And the same remark may be made respecting the word *heart*. This word is sometimes used to express sentient feelings, and sometimes moral exercises; and from a want of discrimination in regard to the different senses of the word, has arisen much of the controversy respecting the power of sinners to make themselves new hearts.

But there is no word in our religious vocabulary which requires discrimination in regard to its use, more than the very common word *feeling*.<sup>\*</sup> This word properly relates to the sentient part of man; and yet, for some reason or other, it is very commonly used in reference to his moral part. Thus we hear about holy feelings, and sinful feelings; and religion, it is said, should be a matter of feeling, and not a mere outside profession.

From a want of discrimination in regard to the meaning of this word, persons often mistake their own characters. In some instances, they have more religion than they think they have; and in others, they have less.—There are some excellent Christians, who are subject to sudden and painful changes of feeling. They get into the dark, as the saying is; nothing goes right with them; they find themselves exceedingly unhappy; and they think, for the time, that they have no religion. We have known some Christians, who had periodical returns of such distressing seasons. And strange as it may seem, we have known some, to whom a strong dish of tea, or a potion of anodyne, would bring almost instantaneous relief. Now it may be true of Christians, in such seasons of distress, and doubt, and fear, that they have more religion than they think they have. The difficulty may be primarily in their sensibilities, or perhaps in their nerves, and not in their moral exercises. They may have as strict a regard for the honour of God and

<sup>\*</sup> It might be well to inquire how this word has come into so common use among Christians of the present day. They certainly did not borrow it from the Bible. We never hear David, or Paul, or John, or any other of the inspired writers, talking about their *feelings*. Yet a Christian now, who should imitate them in this respect, would be regarded in some circles, with much suspicion.

his law, and for the advancement of his kingdom, at such times as ever; and their troubles may be primarily and chiefly sentient.

On the other hand, there may be persons, and there have been thousands, whose sentient feelings mislead them in the opposite direction. They are strongly excited on the subject of religion, are full of something which they call light and joy; and have no doubt, for the time, that their sins are forgiven, and that they are the favourites of heaven. But the event soon proves, that their good feelings, and their religion, were all sentient. It did not reach the moral affections, in such a way as to accomplish a thorough change in them. The gush of excited feeling quickly subsides, and the character becomes ordinarily worse than before.

In opposing a mere outside religion—a religion of morality or of mere forms—evangelical Christians have been accustomed to lay much stress on the feelings. And this is well, if they will but discriminate, and use the word feeling in a safe sense. Too much stress cannot be laid on the moral feelings—the voluntary exercises; for in holy exercises of this kind, the whole of religion essentially consists. But too much stress may be laid on those sorrows, and joys, and griefs, and sympathies, which are merely sentient. There is no religion in feelings of this kind, more than in the feeling of hunger or thirst. Such feelings may be intimately connected with religious exercises, either as prerequisite motives or as consequent emotions; but in themselves, they possess no moral or religious character.

From not discriminating in regard to the different kinds of feelings, persons often misjudge respecting the proper *evidences* of piety.—Here, we will suppose, is a person of strong and excitable passions, whose religion is characterized by seasons of deep feeling. He often weeps at meetings, and on other occasions, and is transported, at times, with the ardour and intensity of his religious affections. He can tell of elevations and depressions, of joys and sorrows, beyond those of his brethren generally. Still his character is not remarkably consistent or uniform. He is fitful and unsteady in his feelings and conduct; to-day up, to-morrow down; to-day intensely engaged in religion, and to-morrow as much engaged in something else. Now this man may think himself an eminent Christian, and may be thought so by others; and we would by no means be understood to say

that he is not a Christian. But we do say that there is much in his character, on which both himself and others may lay considerable stress, on which no dependence can safely be placed. There is much in his supposed religious character which is merely sentient, and in which there is no more religion, than in the crackling of thorns under a pot, or in the tears which are shed at a funeral.

We must not be understood, however, as wishing to discourage feeling in religion. We ought to feel. It is desirable we should feel. It is desirable that the *sentient* feelings should be excited and engaged. Why should they be engaged on every other subject in which we are interested, and be dull and stupid here? But it is important that our religion should go deeper, and that the evidence of it should be laid deeper, than the mere sentient feelings. It is important that we should discriminate in regard to the nature of our feelings, and ever remember, that we have no more of religion, and no less, than we have of *voluntary*, *cheerful* devotedness to God, and a *willingness* to obey his commands. A man may have ever so much mere feeling; he may weep his eyes out in grief, or rise to ecstasy in moments of joy; and still, if he is not voluntarily and perseveringly devoted to God and his service, he cannot have satisfactory evidence that he is a Christian. Or a man may have very little mere sentient feeling—so little as to think that he has none at all, and on this account may reject all hope that he is a child of God; and still, if he is voluntarily and perseveringly devoted to God and his service; if he loves the cause of God, and seeks its advancement, and prefers the peace of Jerusalem above his chief joy; what better evidence can such a person desire, that he is in the number of those who shall enjoy the triumphs of God's holy kingdom forever.—What we wish, let it be repeated, is not to discourage feeling in religion—even sentient feeling, if it is properly regulated; but we wish to insist on something better. There must be a *voluntary* devotedness to God; there must be *principle*—solid, enduring, religious principle; and this may be expected to abide, when the hay, wood, and stubble of a merely sentient and fitful religion are all consumed.

From a want of discrimination in regard to the different kinds of feelings, impenitent sinners are often involved in needless difficulty and trouble.—We frequently see persons,

who believe in the reality of experimental religion, and are sensible of its importance, and know that it is of great importance for them, living year after year in the neglect of it, on the simple ground that they do not, and cannot *feel*. At least, they do not feel so deeply as they think desirable and necessary. Their minds, they think, must be more strongly excited; they must be exercised with deeper sorrow and anguish; and strange as it may seem, they are desiring and longing for spiritual distress. They would give anything they possess, if they could only be wrought up to that pitch of distress and anguish which they think their case requires.

To persons such as these we would say, in the first place, it is impossible for you, in this state of mind, ever to feel the distress you desire. How can you? For the moment you begin to feel distress, your desire begins to be gratified, and this gives you joy; and how can joy and distress exist in the same mind, in relation to the same subject, and at the same instant?—But suppose you could feel all the distress that you desire; you would be not at all the better for it. There is no virtue or holiness in distress. And you would have no more natural ability, or higher obligations, to submit to God, than you have now. To be sure, it might be more likely, in that case, i. e. if your distress arose from proper considerations, that you would submit to God; for the motives in favour of submission would be more powerful. The motives from without would be aided and seconded by powerful motives from within. But you have motives enough now to lay you under entire obligation. You have motives enough now, if duly considered, and suffered to have their proper weight, to secure the concurrence of the will on the side of holiness. If you doubt this, then just look about you, and think over again the various and urgent motives of the gospel;—motives drawn from heaven, earth, and hell;—from the justice of God, and his mercy—his love, and his wrath: and tell me, if here are not motives enough to lead you, and bind you, to an immediate and unconditional submission. Now, it is incumbent on you to consider these motives—to weigh them—and yield to them. And if your reluctant heart shrinks back from a consideration of them, it is incumbent on you to call them up, and press them home upon it, again and again. And if you cannot *feel* as much as you desire, then *submit without feeling*. At any rate, submit to God, and put an

end to your protracted and wicked controversy with him. And if you cannot have, at present, a religion of strong feeling, have that which, in itself, is better—a religion of holy, settled principle,—a religion of voluntary devotedness to God, and of cheerful obedience to his known commands.

The submission of the heart to God is the immediate duty of every sinner; and when the submission is made, it should be the business of after life, to repair the wastes and the mischief which sin had occasioned, and restore harmony to the disordered soul. It should be the business of life, to enlighten and improve those understandings which had been darkened and perverted by abuse and neglect; to repress those appetites and passions which had become strong by indulgence; and to revive and cultivate those nobler sensibilities which had been stifled under the cruel dominion of sin. The feeling of moral obligations should be cultivated, till it becomes so strong, that it cannot be resisted and set at nought with impunity. Our feelings of sympathy should be cultivated, till we find it easy to rejoice with those who rejoice, and to weep with them that weep. The nobler feelings of the soul should all be cultivated, till every external motive to duty shall find a chord of sympathy within; and then the way of life will be a way of pleasantness, and all her paths will be peace.

At present, we cannot pursue this interesting subject farther; and with a few words relative to the author, whose classification of the mental powers has led us into the foregoing train of remark, we must conclude. Without affirming that we agree with Prof. Upham in every minute point of speculation, we have no hesitation in saying that his work is one of great value to the literary and religious community. It indicates throughout, not only deep and varied research, but profound and laborious *thought*, and is a full, lucid, and able discussion of an involved and embarrassing subject. The style, though generally diffuse, is always perspicuous, and often elegant; and the work, as a whole, will add much to the reputation of its author, and entitle him to rank among the ablest metaphysicians of our country.